Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BS1505 .B472
Bennett, W. H. (William Henry), 1MAIN
The religion of the post-exilic prophets
3 9967 00112 5454

ACCESSION NUMBER 42249 SHELF NUMBER BS1505 B472

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the _____ Fund.

RECEIVED April 1916

THE LITERATURE
AND
RELIGION OF ISRAEL

Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITOR'S PREFACE

In a series of ten volumes, of which this is the first published, it is proposed to give an account of the Development of Religion in Israel from the Earliest Times down to the Time of Christ. The general plan of the series is to describe briefly the literature itself and its authorship, and to bring out more fully the character of the ideas contained in it, and show their place in the development of the religion. To each author has been entrusted a definite group of books or portion of literature. While working in sympathy with the general plan, he will at the same time endeavour to make his book a fresh and independent contribution to the knowledge of its subject.

The list of the volumes and of the authors who have undertaken them is given on next page.

THE LITERATURE AND RELIGION OF ISRAEL

FOUNDATIONS—Professor Morris Jastrow, University of Pennsylvania.

INSTITUTIONS AND LEGISLATION—Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, University of Edinburgh.

HISTORY — Professor Hope W. Hogg, University of Manchester.

PSALMS—Professor Buchanan Gray, Mansfield College, Oxford.

PRE-EXILIC PROPHETS—Professor R. H. Kennett, University of Cambridge.

POST-EXILIC PROPHETS—Professor W. H. Bennett, New College and Hackney College, London.

WISDOM LITERATURE—Professor J. Skinner, Westminster College, Cambridge.

HISTORICAL APOLOGUES—Dr. James Moffatt, Broughty Ferry.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE (2 vols.)—Professor R. H. Charles, Oxford.

The conception of this Series, the arrangement of the Literature into Groups, and much else, is due to Professor Skinner. It will be seen that the Editor's task has been comparatively light.

THE RELIGION

OF THE

POST-EXILIC PROPHETS

PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, LITT.D. D.D.

The Literature and Religion of Israel

THE RELIGION

OF THE

POST-EXILIC PROPHETS

BY

W. H. BENNETT, LITT.D., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, NEW COLLEGE AND HACKNEY COLLEGE, LONDON; SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1907

PRINTED AT
THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1505
B47

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THE subject of this volume is the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament of the Exile and the period after the Exile,—beginning therefore with the Fall of Jerusalem in B.C. 586, and extending to some time after B.C. 300. The ministry of Jeremiah continued some little time after B.C. 586, and that of Ezekiel began a few years before that date; for the sake of convenience the entire works of Ezekiel are dealt with here, and all the prophecies of Jeremiah are assigned to the volume on the Pre-Exilic Prophets. The critical standpoint is substantially that of Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

This volume is in two parts. In the first part the prophets are treated individually, in chronological order. In each case some account is given of the history of the prophet and his times; of the criticism of the book in which his prophecies are preserved; of the contents and teaching of these prophecies; and of the significance of the prophet for the religious history of Israel. In the second part the general

teaching of this literature is expounded in relation to the main subjects of Dogmatics.

A word may be said as to the method of transliteration of Hebrew words: when they first occur they are provided with the usual diacritical marks, but afterwards these are mostly omitted in order that the page may not be unduly burdened with dots and dashes—thus in the first instance, *ḥeṣedh*, *'ōlâ*, afterwards *hesedh*, *ola*.

The translation given is usually the Revised Version; sometimes another translation is used, and then the source is indicated. In other cases where a translation differs from the Revised Version it is the author's own, the Hebrew being in a few instances slightly paraphrased.

I wish to express my thanks to the Rev. A. E. Chisman, B.D., for valuable assistance in reading proofs, verifying references, and compiling indices.

CONTENTS

PAGE

EDITOR'S PREFACE TO THE SERIES - - - - - -

AUTHOR'S PREFACE - - - - - - - - - - vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS - - - - - - - - - ix

PART I.

REVIEW OF THE TEACHING AND WORK OF THE PROPHETS FROM EZEKIEL TO THE CLOSE OF THE CANON.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AT THE BEGINNING OF THE EXILE 3

CHAPTER II.

EZEKIEL - - - - - - - - - - - - - 15

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPHET OF THE RESTORATION - - - - - - 36

Isaiah xl., xli., xlii. 10—xlviii., xlix. 14—l. 3, li. 1—lii. 12, liv., lv.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH - - - - - - - - 51

Isaiah xlii. 1-4 (5-9); xlix. 1-6 (7-13); l. 4-9 (10, 11); lii. 13—liii. 12.

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

Other Anonymous Prophecies of the Exile - - - - 60
Isaiah xiii. 1—xiv. 23, xxi. 1-10; Jeremiah l., li.; Zechariah ii. 6-13.

CHAPTER VI.

Haggai and Zechariah - - - - - - - - - 65
Haggai, Zechariah i. 1—ii. 5, iii. 1—viii. 23.

CHAPTER VII.

Obadiah - - - - - - - - - - - - - 86

CHAPTER VIII.

Malachi - - - - - - - - - - - - - 88

CHAPTER IX.

Isaiah lvi.—lxvi. - - - - - - - - - - - 103

CHAPTER X.

The Greek Period - - - - - - - - - - - 114
Joel, Zechariah ix.—xiv., Jonah, Isaiah xxiv.—xxvii.

PART II.

Exposition of the Various Doctrines of the Exilic and Post-Exilic Prophets.

CHAPTER I.

The Nature and Attributes of God - - - - - 133

CHAPTER II.

PAGE
God and the World, Nature - - - - - - - 171

CHAPTER III.

God and Man, the Gentiles - - - - - - - 185

CHAPTER IV.

God and Israel - - - - - - - - - - 192

CHAPTER V.

Revelation - - - - - - - - - - - 199

CHAPTER VI.

Nature of Man - - - - - - - - - - 223

CHAPTER VII.

The Normal Religious Life - - - - - - - 245

CHAPTER VIII.

Righteousness and Sin - - - - - - - - 257

CHAPTER IX.

Rewards and Punishments - - - - - - - 277

CHAPTER X.

Atonement and Final Reprobation - - - - - 295

CHAPTER XI.

The Future of Israel and the World: the Kingdom of God - - - - - - - - - - - 335

CHAPTER XII.

PAGE
The Messiah - - - - - - - - - - - - 347

CHAPTER XIII.

The Individual after Death - - - - - - - 361

Literature - - - - - - - - - - - - 377

Index of Subjects - - - - - - - - - - 381

Index of Scripture Passages - - - - - - - 384

PART I.

REVIEW OF THE TEACHING AND WORK OF THE PROPHETS FROM EZEKIEL TO THE CLOSE OF THE CANON.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AT THE BEGINNING OF THE EXILE.

The selection of a given date as the dividing-point between two periods is always in some measure arbitrary and conventional, and the assignment of the Fall of Jerusalem as the beginning of an exilic era is no exception to the rule. Many threads, social, religious, and even political, preserved a continuity between the life of the citizens of the Southern Kingdom and that of the Jews in exile. Moreover, the closing period of the Jewish Monarchy and the Exile really overlapped; there was a community of Jews settled in Babylon several years before the Fall of Jerusalem.

The beginning of the Exile, therefore, is rather a period than a point of time; and when we recognise this, it appears that the choice of this period as the opening of a new era is only very slightly arbitrary. There were revolutionary changes which destroyed the old Israel and prepared the way for the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. For the first of these we have to go back about twenty years. The fall of Nineveh and the rise of Babylon marked the end of the old political system of the Israelite world; the destruction of Jerusalem by the

Chaldeans terminated the Jewish state and the national worship of the Temple; the Captivity in Babylonia brought large Jewish communities into contact with novel surroundings; the climate and physical features of the great Babylonian plain with its magnificent rivers instead of the highlands of Judah and the crooked, shallow Jordan; the society, religion, and politics of a great empire instead of the life of the city state which Judah had become towards the close of its national existence.

Nevertheless the religion of the Jews in the early days of the Exile was substantially the religion of ancient Israel in the form it had assumed during the reigns of the last kings of Judah; so that we must begin our account of the former with a brief sketch of the latter.

Religion was universal in Israel; every one was in some fashion or other religious, as in all peoples at that stage of development. The pre-exilic documents do not speak of men abandoning religion, but denounce them because they forsake Yahweh for some other god. But in spite of this, probably most Israelites remaining in Judah worshipped Yahweh, the God of the land and the people; although exiles living, so to speak, within the jurisdiction of other gods, might transfer their ecclesiastical allegiance, taking it for granted that religion was territorial.

Nevertheless the general worship of Yahweh existed side by side with great variety of faith and practice; allowing for difference of scale, there was as little uniformity as there is amongst the adherents of Christianity to-day. To many, attendance at Solomon's Temple did not seem incompatible with occasional visits to the shrines of Baal, of the Sun, or of the Queen of Heaven; just

as the English Protestant may attend the Established Church in the morning and a Baptist Chapel in the evening; while the devotion of a Romanist to his patron saint does not prevent him from paying a measure of homage to other saints; and there is a kind of Christianity which seeks to conciliate the Devil. For the most part the ancient Oriental accepted such eclecticism as legitimate, natural, and obvious.

As there was a large range of choice in deities and as to the amount of devotion shown to each, there was much external variety in religion. But, with important exceptions, the spiritual value of the varieties was the same. The religious life of the average man was not seriously affected by the number or the names of the gods he worshipped. Each cult had its devotees, but, as a rule, the quality of their devotion was the same; just as the fervour of Romanist, Anglican, and Methodist evangelists differs rather in externals than in essentials.

Before considering the differences between the ordinary varieties of religious life and Revealed Religion we may briefly indicate the features common to them all. All satisfied the conditions laid down by *Hebrews*[1] for access to God, "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him"; religious feeling found expression in prayer and praise, and, with possible exceptions, sacrifice was the supreme act of worship, possessing, as we should say, a special sacramental value. It was believed that supernatural beings were numerous; and that they were good and evil, and it was not held that such beings were either

[1] Ch. xi. 6

under the absolute control of an omnipotent head, nor yet that they were in perfect harmony with one another, "there was war in heaven".[1] In most cases religion had some ethical value; other things being equal, deities would approve of acts in accordance with the current standards of morality; but the local character of most deities limited the moral demands of religion to towns, tribes, or nations; and the belief in evil supernatural beings, and in the imperfect morality of many of the gods, encouraged vice, oppression, and cruelty.

Many varieties might be distinguished amongst the worshippers of Yahweh, followers of other gods who paid a minor homage to the God of Israel; Jews who placed Him first but still only accorded to Him a divided allegiance; and devotees whose religious fervour was centred upon Him. But for our purpose we need only consider three varieties of Yahwism: (i.) The traditional religion of Israel; (ii.) The new Eclecticism; (iii.) The Prophetic Revelation.

(i.) *The Traditional Religion of Israel.*—This stage of the spiritual development of Israel is represented by the older documents used in the composition of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings,[2] and is often referred to in the pre-exilic prophets.[3]

Inasmuch as Israel formed part of an international system, its life was involved in mutual action and reaction with the other members of that system, and shared the features enumerated above as common to the religions of the Israelite world[4] at that time. To many the chief

[1] Rev. xii. 7.

[2] J, E, and others of the same school and period.

[3] *Cf.* Prof. Kennett's volume in this series.

[4] *I.e.*, Babylonia, Assyria, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, and Egypt.

characteristic of the faith of Israel would be that God was worshipped as Yahweh and not as Chemosh, Assur, or Merodach.

But there were other distinctive features. Ritual and other institutions derived something from the religious movements of earlier ages, especially from the work of Moses and Samuel. Moreover, the relation of Yahweh to Israel and Palestine had a suggestive history. Yahweh had not always been the God of Israel, the worship of Yahweh was associated with the deliverance from Egypt; He had chosen Israel and the people had voluntarily yielded their allegiance to Him. Again Israel, until the fall of the Northern Kingdom, was never a homogeneous state under a single government; its unity was religious rather than political, so that Yahweh was the symbol of unity and brotherhood between a group of kindred tribes. Moreover, Yahweh was not originally the Lord of Palestine, His home was at Sinai; He had conquered Palestine with and for His people. Thus Yahweh had a large moral influence, freedom and spontaneity, wide range of action, detachment from mere local associations, that distinguished Him from a god like Chemosh who formed part of an organic unity with a district and a tribe.

On the other hand, the actual Israel of the monarchy was formed by the amalgamation of the Israelites and the Canaanites, with the natural result that Yahweh was sometimes identified and sometimes associated with the Canaanite Baals; and sometimes there was a tendency to resolve Yahweh into a group of local Baals.

Thus the traditional religion of Israel involved enthusiasm for Yahweh, the mutual devotion of Yahweh and Israel, hallowed and exalted by the history of the people

and the conditions of their national life. This devotion found expression in ritual and sacrifices at many shrines, but according to popular ideas the favour of Yahweh was to be bought with gifts, and Yahweh was the champion of His people apart from their character and conduct. For most men devotion to Yahweh was quite consistent with a secondary recognition of other gods.

(ii.) *The New Eclecticism.*—Towards the close of the monarchy the normal eclecticism of ancient religious life assumed a new character. Many things had been making for uniformity of worship. The Jewish state was almost limited to the city of Jerusalem, and the Temple of Solomon was its one important sanctuary. The high places or country sanctuaries, which had often been the centres of a corrupt eclectic worship of Yahweh and local Baals, had been devastated by foreign invaders and suppressed by the Jewish kings who were devotees of the Temple. Yahweh, as worshipped on Mount Zion, had alone successfully resisted all His enemies. At the same time He was in danger of becoming the mere local deity of a provincial capital.

On the other hand, the people with whom Yahweh was so closely connected was falling to pieces under repeated blows inflicted by foreign conquerors. Again and again whole tribes and clans had been carried away captive, and large districts had been lost to Israel. To many Yahweh seemed discredited and moribund. If men did not actually abandon His worship, they turned to other deities and often assigned a very subordinate place to the God of Israel. If the other local deities of Palestine had also lost prestige, men still worshipped the Divine King, Melech (Moloch) often identified with Yahweh, and often with

Milcom of Ammon; but they also turned to the gods of their conquerors, the Babylonian worship of the heavenly deities and the members of the Egyptian Pantheon. Thus Manasseh worshipped all the Host of Heaven,[1] so that Josiah found in the Temple the apparatus for this worship; and in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem there were those who burned incense "unto Baal, to the Sun, Moon, planets, and all the Host of Heaven"; and at the gate of the Temple, horses and chariots dedicated to the Sun; and outside Jerusalem there were ancient sanctuaries of the Zidonian Ashtoreth, the Moabite Chemosh and the Ammonite Milcom, believed to have been built by Solomon.[2] In the same way Jeremiah speaks of the kings, princes, priests, prophets and people of Jerusalem as devotees of the Sun, Moon, and all the Host of Heaven;[3] and we gather from the same prophet that the worship of the Queen of Heaven, Ishtar, usually the morning star, Venus, was specially popular in the last days of Jewish independence.[4]

So too Ezekiel describes various scenes in the courts of the Temple; an "image of jealousy"; seventy elders worshipping idols in the form of wall-pictures of creeping things and abominable beasts; women weeping for Tammuz; and five and twenty men worshipping the Sun.[5] He also tells us of certain elders among the captives who came to inquire of Yahweh, and the word of Yahweh came unto the prophet, "These men have taken their idols into their heart".[6]

A special form of eclecticism had arisen in Northern

[1] 2 Kings xxi. 3.
[2] 2 Kings xxiii. 4 f., 11-13.
[3] Jer. viii. 1, 2.
[4] Jer. vii. 18, xliv. 17 ff.
[5] Ezek. viii.
[6] Ezek. xiv. 1-3; *cf.* xx. 30 f.

Palestine. After the bulk of the Israelite population had been carried away captive, their place was filled by Gentile immigrants from various parts of the Assyrian empire. A plague of lions induced the new-comers to add the worship of Yahweh as the local deity to their own tribal cults.[1] For this worship of Yahweh they utilised the ancient sanctuaries, the high places and their priests. It is practically certain that a remnant of Israelites were left in the land, and amalgamated with the Gentile immigrants, so that there came to be in Samaria a community, partly of Israelite origin, and combining the cult of heathen gods with the traditional worship of Yahweh conducted at the ancient sanctuaries by representatives of old priesthoods. This development of the religion of Israel played an important part in the later history.

What we have styled the New Eclecticism should, according to all precedent and probability, have been an infallible sign of the impending final collapse of the religion of Israel. The national religion seemed on the point of disappearing with the national government, although the worship of Yahweh might have survived for a time as a petty local superstition, on the same level with those of the surrounding tribes.

(iii.) *The Prophetic Revelation.*—The religion of Israel was saved from extinction by the inspired prophets whose work is recorded and whose writings are preserved in the Old Testament. Their teaching was a development of the highest elements in the traditional faith, so that they were the true representatives and successors of Abraham and Moses.

[1] 2 Kings xvii. 24-41.

For them, as for other Israelites, the central truth was that Yahweh was the God of Israel, and that Israel was the people of Yahweh; but in some respects they taught the doctrine with unusual thoroughness. They denounced all forms of eclecticism, Israel must worship Yahweh and Yahweh only, and they must not identify Him with any other God; they must not apply to Him ordinary titles like Baal, "Lord,"[1] or Melech, "King,"[2] because these titles were also used of the deities of neighbouring peoples.

In the same spirit the prophets demanded that idolatry, and magic, together with the unchaste and cruel rites characteristic of many Gentile cults should not be associated with the worship of Yahweh.

The inspired prophets were also at variance with popular views in their teaching as to the method of securing the favour of Yahweh. The people held that His favour could be bought by external ritual, especially by sacrifices; the prophets taught that these were worthless apart from justice, purity and benevolence. The people believed that Yahweh would under all circumstances protect His Chosen Race, and especially that His Temple was the palladium of Jerusalem; but the prophets declared that He would punish the sins of Israel by the ruin of the nation and the captivity of the people. Some[3] maintain that the prophets altogether repudiated sacrifice and other external observances; and, in any case, they rele-

[1] Hosea ii. 16.

[2] The comparatively rare use of Melech as a title of Yahweh in the pre-exilic and exilic prophets seems to indicate that it was deliberately avoided. *Cf.* Boehm, *A. T. Unterbau des Reiches Gottes*, p. 92.

[3] *E.g.*, Smend, p. 167.

gated ritual to an altogether subordinate position and laid supreme stress on the moral demands of Yahweh. These demands Israel had utterly failed to satisfy, therefore Yahweh would cast them off, and would make the Gentile powers His instruments to chastise His people.

Such teaching implied that Yahweh was no mere national deity; his existence was not bound up with that of Israel. The God who could control Babylon and Egypt, the great powers of the age, was practically omnipotent, and therefore the one supreme God. Other deities might disappear when their lands were conquered by the worshippers of other gods, and their peoples carried into captivity; but the prophets made it clear that Yahweh could exist apart from Israel, from Palestine, from Jerusalem, and from its Temple.

It is not yet clear how far the pre-exilic prophets[1] attained to any definite conviction that the Chosen People would return to Palestine and resume the worship of Yahweh in a temple at Jerusalem; nor can we be sure that the Messianic passages found amongst their writings are not later additions—these pictures of an ideal future for Israel under a Righteous King of the House of David may not have been drawn till after the Fall of the Monarchy. What, then, were the expectations of the prophets as to the future of Revealed Religion? They may have been absorbed in the interests of their own generations, and may not have faced the problems of the future. But the present writer believes that there are sufficient indications that the prophetic faith included the restoration of the Chosen People to the Holy Land, and the continuous

[1] *Cf.* Kennett.

development of Revealed Religion. The principle of the doctrine of Restoration was involved in Isaiah's teaching that the deliverance from Sennacherib was a Divine intervention in the interests of the true faith. If Israel was the chosen instrument of God's purposes then, it could hardly perish utterly while those purposes remained unaccomplished. The doctrine is expressly stated in various passages in the Book of Jeremiah.[1]

The religious situation shortly after the Fall of Jerusalem was the direct sequel of that which has just been sketched. The Jews were now broken up into four main groups: the communities in Babylonia; the hybrid population of Samaria; the remnant in Judah; and the refugees in Egypt. The last we hear of the Egyptian Jews suggests that they were for the most part quickly absorbed into the Gentile population.[2] The Samaritan eclecticism[3] would not be immediately affected by the destruction of the Jewish state. The remnant in Judah would be drawn in different directions by two opposing influences; the neighbouring Samaritans might encourage an adulterated worship of Yahweh, while patriotism, stimulated by local associations and by reminiscences of prophetic teaching, would make for exclusive devotion to the God of Israel.

But the most important portion of the Jewish people consisted of the exiles in Babylonia; these exiles included representatives alike of the conventional religious tradition, of the new eclecticism, and of the prophetic Revelation. Men of all schools, however, would be susceptible of the impulse to generous loyalty towards their people in

[1] It seems reasonable to admit the Jeremianic origin of some, at any rate, of these passages; but *cf.* Kennett.

[2] Jer. xliv.

[3] *Cf.* p. 9.

the hour of misfortune; they would also be sensible of the confirmation of prophetic teaching by the fulfilment of the predictions of the ruin of Judah; and these two influences would combine to keep the Jews faithful to Yahweh, and to lead them to accept Jeremiah and Ezekiel as authoritative exponents of the Divine Will. Ancient religious traditions would lose much of their authority through the failure of local associations. Men whose religion was merely conventional would in some cases attach themselves to the dominant prophetic party; while in others they would be absorbed in the surrounding Gentile worship. The new eclecticism would often be a stepping-stone to full-fledged heathenism. It seems, however, that the exiles were largely settled in communities with municipal autonomy, and the common feeling of these societies would check apostasy. On the other hand, many must have been pressed into the service of the Babylonian government and of private persons, and would often fall away from the faith of Israel.[1]

[1] *Cf.* the story of Daniel and his companions.

CHAPTER II.

EZEKIEL.

THE Book of Ezekiel may still be regarded as one of the fixed points of Old Testament criticism. Attempts have indeed been made to place it in the period immediately following the Exile or even later,[1] but so far with very little success. Moreover, the significance of the book for the development of theology would not be seriously affected if it were placed soon after the Return. That event did not greatly alter the circumstances of the Jewish community in Babylonia; for them the exile still continued, and the feeble beginnings of a new order in Palestine were merely an earnest of the real restoration of Israel. We shall treat the contents of the book as the work of Ezekiel between B.C. 593 and 571; but our statements as to its teaching would need only slight modification if it were placed somewhat later. Neither do the other critical questions call for special notice. It is possible, perhaps probable, that the book as we have it has been compiled from earlier collec-

Date and Authorship.

[1] Zunz, Seinecke, etc., *E.B.*, col. 1460.

tions of Ezekiel's prophecies;[1] and that in the process some additions have been made.[2]

It is probable that many of the symbolic actions apparently attributed to Ezekiel were never performed, but merely imagined and described. On the other hand, it does not seem probable that some of the symbolic actions, *e.g.*, the prolonged periods of silence[3] and the lying on one side for 390 days,[4] were due to cataleptic seizures.[5] But none of these controverted points are important for our purpose, though the suggestion of catalepsy might be regarded either as gain or loss for modern apologetics according to the way in which it was handled.

The canonical status of the book is unimpeachable; the rabbis were contented with the harmonistic efforts to which Gamaliel's contemporary, Hananiah ben Hezekiah, devoted a prolonged seclusion illuminated by 300 measures of oil;[6] and modern scholars will not wish to exclude Ezekiel either on account of the obscurities connected with the mysterious chariot of Yahweh, or because of the discrepancies with the Pentateuchal law.

The Book of Ezekiel falls into four great divisions:

[1] Bertholet, *Hesekiel*, p. xxii., accepts Cornill's view that Ezekiel compiled two successive editions of the book. The suggestion has also been made, in view of the numerous repetitions, that our book is a combination of two parallel editions of the prophecies (Kraetzschmar, *Ezechiel*, p. xiii.).

[2] Ezekiel's legal section, the Temple and the priesthood in the New Israel, xl.-xlviii., and the Law of Holiness, Lev. xvii.-xxvi., may be regarded as contemporary documents, partly arising out of the same circumstances and based on the same sources, without exactly defining their literary relationship.

[3] Ch. iii. 26, xxiv. 27, xxxiii. 22.

[4] Ch. iv. 4, 5.

[5] So Klostermann; see Skinner, p. 55.

[6] Kraetzschmar, p. xiv.

(i.) i.-xxiv., Prophecies of Doom delivered before the Fall of Jerusalem in B.C. 586; (ii.) xxv.-xxxii., Oracles against the Nations; (iii.) xxxiii.-xxxix., Prophecies of Restoration delivered after the Fall of Jerusalem; (iv.) xl.-xlviii., Ordinances for Public Worship, etc., in the Restored Israel.

Ezekiel, Contents.

The first division, i.-xxiv., opens with a Theophany[1] in Chaldea, by the River Chebar, in which the Vision of God is seen upon a throne borne by marvellous living creatures; "above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was a likeness as the appearance of a man upon it above. . . . This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh."[2] Ezekiel receives his prophetic commission. Next[3] the siege and fall of Jerusalem are set forth by a series of symbols; and again[4] the same message is delivered in plain terms. Chapter viii. describes the superstitions practised at Jerusalem even in the Temple itself, the worship of "creeping things and abominable beasts in the chambers of imagery" by seventy elders; the women weeping for Tammuz; and five and twenty men in the inner court of the Temple worshipping the Sun with their faces to the East and their backs to the Temple.

Then[5] Destroying Angels slay all the inhabitants of Jerusalem except the faithful worshippers of Yahweh, who receive a mark upon their foreheads. The Glory of Yahweh appears in the Temple—the living creatures are now called Cherubim; the ruin of the city is again an-

[1] Ezek. i.-iii. [2] Ezek. i. 26 ff. [3] Ezek. iv., v.
[4] Ezek. vi., vii. [5] Ezek. ix.-xi.

nounced, with a promise of restoration; and the Glory of Yahweh leaves the Temple by the east gate and departs from Jerusalem. Chapter xii. contains more symbols of the speedy fall of the city, and the exile of the remnant of the population.

Next,[1] Ezekiel denounces the prophets and prophetesses and those who consult them. Further prophecies of ruin follow.[2]

In two striking chapters[3] we have a description of the disloyalty, first of Jerusalem, then of Jerusalem and Samaria throughout their history. The fortunes of the last kings of Judah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachim and Zedekiah, are depicted under the symbols[4] of cedars or vines plucked up and withered, and of the captive whelps of a lioness (Judah); there is also a promise that a tender twig from the top of the cedar shall be planted in the mountain of the height of Israel, and become a goodly cedar, *i.e.*, a young scion of the royal house shall become a mighty king of the restored Israel.[5]

Chapter xviii. contains the celebrated exposition of Ezekiel's doctrine of Retribution.[6]

In xx. 1-44 the prophet shows how Yahweh has remained faithful to Israel in spite of Israel's persistent disloyalty.

The imminent ruin of Jerusalem and Judah is set forth under yet more symbols.[7] A chapter[8] is devoted to a

[1] Ezek. xiii. 1 - xiv. 11. [2] Ezek. xiv. 12 - xv.

[3] Ezek. xvi., xxiii.; for the sake of clearness the exact order is not followed here and elsewhere; *cf.* pp. 29 ff.

[4] Ezek. xvii., xix. [5] Ezek. xvii. 22-24. [6] See p. 32.

[7] Ezek. xx. 45 - xxi. 27, xxiv. 1-14. The judgment on Ammon, xxi. 28-32, is suggested by the previous section.

[8] Ezek. xxii.

wholesale denunciation of princes, prophets and priests, and all classes of the people.

The first division closes with the account of the death of Ezekiel's wife.[1] The prophet is forbidden to mourn for her, as a symbol that soon the distress at the fall of Jerusalem shall make the people neglect the ordinary funeral customs.

The second division, xxv.-xxxii., contains oracles against Ammon, Moab, Edom, and the Philistines, Tyre and Zidon, Egypt. References[2] to the restoration of Israel are naturally suggested by the predictions of the ruin of their enemies. The absence of any oracle against Babylon is easily explained by the circumstances.

Here we have the great pictures of the wealth and world-wide commerce of Tyre, and the description of the reception of Pharaoh and his army in Sheol by Asshur and the former oppressors of Israel. The conditional character of Old Testament predictions is shown by a comparison of two passages referring to Tyre. Ezek. xxvi. 7-14 declares that Nebuchadrezzar shall capture the city; but it appears from xxix. 17-20 that Nebuchadrezzar's siege of Tyre was unsuccessful. The prophet does not think it necessary to explain away the failure of his prediction, but promises to give the Chaldean king by way of compensation "the land of Egypt for his labour wherewith he served, because they wrought for me, saith the Lord Yahweh".

The third division,[3] xxxiii.-xxxix., is chiefly occupied with promises of restoration, a restoration, however, accompanied by a winnowing of the people, the punish-

[1] Ezek. xxiv. 15-27. [2] Ezek. xxviii. 24-26, xxix. 21.

[3] *Cf.* pp. 32 ff.

ment of obstinate sinners, and the deliverance of the penitent. To this end Ezekiel himself is a watchman,[1] warning all his fellow-countrymen; those who heed will escape; those who turn a deaf ear will perish. In spite of past sins, the penitent will be delivered and counted "righteous".[2] The news of the fall of Jerusalem suggests to the prophet yet another denunciation[3] of the sins of the people, both at Jerusalem and in exile, and of the evil government of the rulers or "shepherds". But now Yahweh will intervene,[4] and grant His people prosperity under a righteous shepherd, "my servant David," a king of the Davidic dynasty, under whom the two divisions of the Chosen People, Judah and Israel, purified from sin, shall be restored to their own land.

In this connexion Ezekiel strikes a note which sounds again and again in the later literature; Edom, "Mount Seir," hoped to profit by the disasters of her kinsfolk, but she shall be laid waste.[5]

Then[6] the prophet promises that the desolate mountains of Israel shall again be inhabited. Yahweh for His own name's sake will restore His people, in spite of their sins. He will cleanse them, and will give them a new heart and a new spirit, and cause them to obey Him. Then they will repent.[7]

In xxxvii. 1-14 we have the vision of the Valley full of Dry Bones, which are clothed with sinews and flesh and skin, and receive breath, so that they stand on their feet, "an exceeding great army," a figure of the resurrection of the nation, and its return to Canaan.

[1] Ezek. xxxiii. 1-9. [2] Ezek. xxxiii. 10-20.
[3] Ezek. xxxiii. 21 - xxxiv. 19. [4] Ezek. xxxiv. 20-31, xxxvii. 15-28.
[5] Ezek. xxxv. [6] Ezek. xxxvi. [7] *Cf.* pp. 304 f.

Then[1] there is the apocalyptic picture of the distant future when the nations of the earth shall gather under the leadership of Gog to trouble the security of restored Israel. His countless hordes perish in the Holy Land.

The section closes[2] with a renewed promise of the return of the exiles.

The fourth division, xl.-xlviii., resembles one of the codes of the Pentateuch rather than a section of a prophetical book. It has much in common with the Pentateuchal *Law of Holiness*.[3]

The form and method of these chapters, however, are similar to those of the rest of the book. On a given date, "in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten" [April, B.C. 572], "the hand of Yahweh was upon me, and He brought me thither. In the visions of God brought He me into the land of Israel." An angel shows Ezekiel the plan and dimensions of the Temple.[4]

Then the Glory of Yahweh appears, coming from the East, and re-enters the Temple, as It had left, by the eastern gate.[5]

Ezekiel is taken in the spirit into the inner court, and in the presence of the Divine Glory receives the law that the palace and tombs of the kings must no longer be hard by the Temple, as in former times.[6] He is shown the

[1] Ezek. xxxviii. 1-xxxix. 24. [2] Ezek. xxxix. 25-29.

[3] Leviticus xvii.-xxvi., and connected passages. This *Law of Holiness* has sometimes been ascribed to Ezekiel. More probably the two works are both based on the customs of the Jerusalem priesthood towards the close of the Monarchy, possibly in part on written notes of the Temple ritual.

[4] Ezek. xl. ff. [5] Ezek. xliii. 1-4. [6] Ezek. xliii. 5-12.

dimensions and plan of the altar; and is told the ritual for the consecration of the altar by the Levitical priests of the House of *Z*adok.[1] He is next directed that the eastern gate of the Temple shall be shut for ever, no one is to pass through it; but the prince[2] may eat there before Yahweh.[3]

Directions are given as to the ministers of the Temple; the old custom of employing *hieroduli*, heathen Temple slaves, is to be done away with; only Israelites are to be employed in the sacred service. Moreover, the higher offices are to be reserved for the Levitical priests of the House of *Z*adok, the old Jerusalem priests; while the Levitical priests from the provinces, the priests of the high places, were only allowed to perform menial duties. Various other regulations for priests are added as to their clothing, food, dues, and such matters.[4] This distinction between *Z*adokite and non-*Z*adokite priests is a sequel of the suppression of the high places required by *Deuteronomy*[5] and carried out by Josiah.[6] *Deuteronomy* enacted that any provincial priest, Levite,[7] might come to Jerusalem[8] and be received as a full member of the priesthood of the Temple. Josiah had brought the provincial priests to Jerusalem, and provided for their maintenance out of the Temple revenues, but they had been excluded from priestly duties.[9] Ezekiel's proposal is a somewhat one-sided compromise between the claims of the two classes

[1] Ezek. xliii. 13-27. [2] Nasi, נָשִׂיא [3] Ezek. xliv. 1-3.
[4] Ezek. xliv. 14-31. [5] Deut. xii. [6] 2 Kings xxii. f.
[7] The Deuteronomic term is "the priests the Levites," *i.e.*, the Levitical priests.
[8] Deut. xviii. 6-8. [9] 2 Kings xxiii. ff.

of priests; he himself was a member of the House of Zadok.

A later section[1] gives further regulations as to sacrifices and offerings; the prince is specially charged with making provision for these. In this connexion there are also exhortations to righteous government;[2] and regulations guarding against the permanent alienation of land from the royal house, or from private families.[3]

These legal details are interrupted by an apocalyptic vision[4] of the transformation of the land in the ideal future. A great river is to issue from the Temple, and flow eastward, rendering the whole district fertile; only the marshes are to be left to provide salt. The river is to swarm with fish, and upon its banks shall grow marvellous trees, bearing fruit every month and having leaves with healing virtues.

Finally[5] the land is divided afresh amongst the twelve tribes; their territory is now limited to Western Palestine. The land is divided into strips by parallel lines running due east and west, and each tribe, Levi excepted, receives one of these strips. The order from the northward is as follows: Dan, Asher, Naphtali, Manasseh, Ephraim, Reuben, Judah; the next strip is divided between the priests, the Levites, the prince, the Temple, and Jerusalem; the Temple is placed in the midst, the city being removed somewhat southwards; then follow strips assigned to Benjamin, Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun and Gad. The idea of this scheme is to preserve the ancient order, subject to the necessity of finding room for

[1] Ezek. xlv. 9 - xlvi. 24. [2] Ezek. xlv. 9. [3] Ezek. xlvi. 16-18.
[4] Ezek. xlvii. 1-12. [5] Ezek. xlv. 1-8, xlvii. 13 - xlviii. 35.

the eastern tribes, keeping the Temple on its old site, and placing it in the centre of the tribes.

A noticeable feature is the position of the secular head of the community; he is no longer "king" but "prince," and his main function is to care for the material needs of the Temple.

Ezekiel.

We know nothing of Ezekiel except from this book. There is no reason to believe that either Josephus[1] or the reporters of various Jewish legends had access to any other source of authentic information. The prophet's ministry, as we have said, belongs to the period B.C. 593-571; the year of his birth is not given, but he seems to have been born about B.C. 622,[2] about the time of Josiah's reforms and the publication of Deuteronomy. In his early childhood Judah enjoyed a transient prosperity. Probably the kingdom was still subject to Assyria, but the dying empire held its dependencies with a loose grasp, and Josiah was practically independent. The reforms, sealed by a solemn covenant, seemed to have reconciled the Jews to God; there were brightening prospects both in politics and religion, a new heaven and a new earth. Ezekiel, too, was a child of a priestly family of Jerusalem; and the reforms had made the Temple the only legitimate

[1] *Antt.*, bk. x., ch. v., states that Ezekiel wrote *two* books; *cf.* also ch. vi. and vii. Christian legends made him a worker of miracles, and stated that he met Pythagoras in Mesopotamia and instructed him in the Jewish wisdom. In the Middle Ages his supposed grave near Bagdad was a favourite place of pilgrimage. See Schmalzl, *Ezechiel*, p. 4.

[2] His call is dated five years after the captivity of Jehoiachin (597 B.C.), *i.e.*, B.C. 592, Ezek. i. 2, and he may very well have been about thirty at the time.

sanctuary, and its ministers the sole priesthood. The family and friends of the future prophet would be enthusiastic about the new dispensation; and Ezekiel, young as he was, may have caught something of their spirit, and felt that he was living in a golden age. Yet the reforms had raised new difficulties; when Josiah suppressed the provincial sanctuaries, the "high places," he had brought their priests to Jerusalem and sought to obtain for them a share in the privileges of the Temple priesthood, a policy which gave rise to bitter disputes.[1]

But soon the crash came, Josiah fell in the rout at Megiddo, and the new heavens and the new earth tumbled about the ears of the Jerusalem priesthood, and Jerusalem was again and again besieged and taken, and was ruled by the nominees of Egyptian and Babylonian kings. Josiah's religious policy was discredited by the disastrous death of the reforming king, and was succeeded by a violent reaction. Apparently most of the prophets and priests turned away from the teaching of the true prophets of Yahweh. Amidst this welter of wickedness and misery, with all its disappointment and disenchantment, Ezekiel spent his boyhood and early manhood; probably his own family remained part of a faithful minority of whom Jeremiah was the spokesman. The teaching and personality of Jeremiah were the most powerful religious influence in the early life of Ezekiel; "He had," in Jeremiah, "a master interpreting events to him to whose influence every page of his prophecies bears witness".[2] Another set of circumstances, too, powerfully affected him

[1] *Cf.* 2 Kings xxiii. 8 f., Deut. xviii. 6 ff., Ezek. xliv. 10-16.
[2] *C.B.S.*, xix. We doubt whether this applies to xl.-xlviii.

—his training in the priestly ritual and traditions and his duties as an officiating priest of the Temple.[1]

In B.C. 597 the future prophet's personal circumstances underwent a complete revolution. After the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, he was carried away to Babylonia with the king and most of the better classes of the community. It was a great experience, coming at a critical time; the young priest, now probably about twenty-five, was at the right age to profit by it, old enough and not too old. He had had time to learn what Jerusalem and the Temple and Jeremiah could teach, and he still had many years before him in which to discover what Babylonia and exile had to teach. He was taken from the seething caldron of Jewish politics in Jerusalem, and placed in the quiet and leisure of one of the little communities of exiles. He could reflect on the meaning of his earlier experiences, and follow the course of events in Judah with the detached and deliberate judgment of a distant spectator. Moreover, the priest of the Jerusalem Temple cannot have been indifferent to the huge temples, the dignified priesthoods, and the magnificent ritual of Babylonian religion. At last his vivid and fertile imagination, brooding over the problems of his own life and the fortunes of Israel, kindled into the vision of the Chariot and the Cherubim and the shadowy form of Yahweh upborne upon them, and he became conscious of a Divine Spirit possessing him with a message for his fellow-countrymen. While the remnant at Jerusalem were staking everything on a desperate struggle for independence, and the exiles were watching them with anxious sympathy, Ezekiel

[1] It has been doubted, on insufficient grounds, whether Ezekiel actually officiated; *cf.* p. 24, *n.* 2.

had to declare that these patriotic efforts were futile, Judah must perish on account of her sins. To such a message the exiles were obstinately deaf. At this time the prophet's burden was made heavier by personal sorrow; he had married, and his wife was "the desire of his eyes"; they seem to have had no children, and now his wife died suddenly, taken away by a stroke of Yahweh.[1]

At last there came the long-expected catastrophe, Jerusalem fell; most of the remnant were carried away into captivity; the city and the Temple lay in ruins; and Jeremiah and Ezekiel were justified. The fulfilment of his predictions gave new authority to the prophet; and set him free to deliver a more welcome message. He could now speak of a coming restoration, and seek to prepare the exiles for their future destiny as the ideal people of God. He could sketch a constitution for the community restored to its ancient home. With these happier visions the book closes. We know nothing of the prophet's end, doubtless he died long before the close of the Exile. One other feature of his career must be mentioned: he was a popular preacher; his sermons were among the few sensations which relieved the grey monotony of life in exile; men talked about them as they stood at their doors; they invited each other to go and hear Ezekiel; he was "unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument"; and he had about as much religious influence, "they hear thy words," said Yahweh to His prophet, "but they do them not".[2]

This slight sketch may help us to understand Ezekiel's

[1] Ezek. xxiv. 15-18. [2] Ezek. xxxiii. 30 ff.

contributions to theology. He was a man of varied gifts and wide experience. He had known the new and the old; the life of pre-exilic Israel, and the beginnings of Judaism which had its roots in the Exile; Jerusalem and Babylonia. He had lived the sheltered and subordinate life of a son at home, of a disciple of Jeremiah, of a junior in the Temple priesthood; and he had been torn from such surroundings and called to the lonely and painful eminence of a prophetic mission to the exiles. He was priest, prophet, popular preacher, theologian, author, and man of affairs.[1] The place he occupied in the development of the religion of Israel was largely due to the manifold variety of his gifts, activities and opportunities.

The importance of Ezekiel mainly arises out of two facts. First, he lived through the great crisis of the fall of Jerusalem and the beginning of the Exile, and lived long enough to look back upon it. His own faith survived that crisis, and through him others were enabled to persist. Thus it was largely due to Ezekiel that revealed religion was not involved in the fall of the Jewish kingdom, but entered on a new stage of development, over which the prophet exercised great influence. Secondly, the priest and the prophet were so nicely balanced in his character and work that he was enabled to mediate between the sacerdotal and the prophetic tendencies in the religion of Israel. "Ezekiel represents a transition and a compromise; the transition from the ancient Israel of the Monarchy to Judaism; and the compromise between the ethical teaching of the prophets and the popular need for ritual." [2]

[1] Witness xl.-xlviii., the constitution for the New Israel.
[2] *B.I.*, p. 221.

Most of Ezekiel's characteristic teaching may be placed under one or other of these two heads. Because he was the prophet of a great transition we have his doctrines of the Continuity of Revelation, the Divine Transcendence, the Individual's relation to God, the Prophetic Ministry to the Individual, Forgiveness and the regenerating work of the Spirit.

The continuity of Revelation or the persistence of the Divine purpose is a convenient phrase for much that is implied or stated in Ezekiel's writings. The prophet repeats the essential features of the teaching of his predecessors, especially of Jeremiah, namely, the moral nature of Yahweh and His demand that Israel should honour Him by pure morality and spiritual worship; the condemnation of the social, political, and religious life of Israel and Judah; the certainty of Divine judgment; the promise of a restored Israel, prosperous, in a fertile land, under a righteous king. But such repetition in exile, in Babylonia, when the Jewish state had ceased to exist, had a new meaning. The prophets had always addressed themselves to the present needs of their people; in a sense their messages were occasional. It might have been supposed, it was supposed by many, that the message was exhausted with the occasion; but Ezekiel insists that the principles of the prophetic teaching are not invalidated by lapse of time, or change of place, or by great national crises. This idea is illustrated by his reviews of the history of Israel in which he traces the persistence of God in His purpose in spite of the constant recalcitrance of Israel.[1] The same idea inspires some of the prophet's

[1] Ezek. xvi., xxiii.

favourite phrases. Ezekiel says repeatedly that Yahweh acts for His Name's sake, and that Israel and all nations may know that He is Yahweh; in both cases he is using one of Jeremiah's rare phrases as a favourite formula. Again he states more than once that Yahweh will sanctify Himself on or in some person or people.[1]

The Name of Yahweh is His character, and His reputation, as based on the revelation of His character. His earlier utterances by the prophets and the operations of His Providence had caused His Name to stand for certain religious and moral ideals, manifested within Israel, though not by Israel as a nation. It had been evident that it was Yahweh's purpose to make known these ideals and cause them to be realised. Yahweh acts for His name's sake; He persists in His purpose and makes His Revelation continuous and permanent because He is consistent with Himself, and finishes what He begins. In the same way, He acts so that men may know that He is Yahweh, Himself, consistent with His former Revelation and Providence; He sanctifies Himself on men; He marks Himself out, makes Himself known as the one true God.

The doctrine of the Divine Transcendence was also in some measure shaped by the experiences of transition. Ezekiel had known Yahweh as the God of Jerusalem and its Temple; he came to know Him as God present in Babylonia, and controlling the nations of the earth. So far as theory was concerned, Isaiah and Jeremiah had anticipated him; but he had put the theory to the test of experience as they had not. He may not have had a

[1] Ezek. xxxvi. 23, xxxvii. 28.

deeper spiritual fellowship with God, but with his wider experience of men and nations and of the world in general, he had a more awestruck sense of the majesty of God. He was overwhelmed by the Divine Presence as neither Isaiah nor Jeremiah was ;[1] he constantly hears himself addressed by Yahweh as "Son of Man," "Mere Mortal," and his favourite title for God is "Lord Yahweh". There is a constant effort in his writings to express his sense of the Divine Majesty and to avoid anthropomorphism. In the great vision that accompanied his call, he saw above the mysterious living creatures something that seemed like a firmament, and above it "the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone: and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it".[2] Similarly the Divine Majesty is emphasised by the stress laid upon the necessity of Sanctity, *i.e.*, the separation of clean from unclean, of what is consecrated to the service of God from what is common; and also by the central position of the Temple and its isolation from the territories of the secular tribes in the New Israel. At the same time Ezekiel is fully aware that transcendence is only one aspect of the Divine Nature, "the prophet is far from regarding God as a mere transcendent majesty and abstract omnipotence";[3] he enjoys an intimate, though deeply reverential, fellowship with Yahweh, whose "relation to His people or the prophet is not that of one distant or unapproachable".[4]

Similarly the circumstances of the Exile favoured the

[1] Ezek. i. 28, iii. 15, 23.
[2] Ezek. i. 22, 26.
[3] *C.B.S.*, xxxiii.
[4] *C.B.S.*, xxxiv.

development of the doctrine of individual responsibility. As Dr. Skinner puts it,[1] "So long as the Jewish state existed the principle of solidarity remained in force. Men suffered for the sins of their ancestors; individuals shared the punishment incurred by the nation as a whole. But as soon as the nation is dead, when the bonds that unite men in the organism of national life are dissolved, then the idea of individual responsibility comes into immediate operation." After the fall of Jerusalem, the Jewish nation no longer existed as a nation; only scattered individuals were left; if the prophet believed that the religion of Israel was to have a future, and if he had a mission to work for that future, he must take account of these individuals. From among them the new Israel must be built up; they must be stimulated to faith and hope, else they would lapse into heathenism; and they must be inspired with true ideals, else they might make the religion of Israel worse than heathenism. Hence Ezekiel, in the celebrated eighteenth chapter and elsewhere,[2] declares that individuals will not be hopelessly involved in the ruin of the nation, or in the guilt of their ancestors, or even in the consequences of their own past sins. With the new Israel in prospect each individual may at that moment choose good or evil, and by that choice may determine whether he shall be admitted into the Kingdom of God or excluded from it. The exigencies of a supreme crisis thus led Ezekiel to a formal and explicit enunciation of the principle of individual responsibility.

The responsibility of the individual leads at once to the prophetic ministry to the individual. Hence Ezekiel's

[1] *Exp. B.*, p. 143. [2] Ezek. xxxiii. 10 ff.

commission to be a "watchman," and to warn the sinner of the consequences of his sin; and the implied idea that the prophet's preaching will sift his audience, winning individuals though it may fail to dominate the community.[1]

Again, the appeal to the individual to repent, and the offer of deliverance and a place in a restored Israel, necessarily included forgiveness and regeneration. Ezekiel has not only the obvious and usual teaching that the discipline of suffering leads to repentance,[2] but also the characteristic doctrine that God's forgiveness leads men to loathe their past sin.[3] In speaking of the work of the Spirit in regeneration, Ezekiel partly follows Jeremiah; and adds the striking figure of the thirty-seventh chapter according to which the army of dry bones represent Israel dead in trespasses and sins and are quickened to new life by the gift of the Spirit. The prophet's teaching on cleansing, forgiveness, and regeneration by the Spirit are summed up in xxxvi. 24-29, of which Dr. Davidson wrote: "This remarkable passage has no parallel in the Old Testament, and reads like a fragment of a Pauline Epistle".[4] Perhaps nothing in the Bible expresses more forcibly the ideas of the wideness of God's mercy and the power of His restoring grace than the passages[5] in which Ezekiel affirms that God will restore not only Jerusalem and Samaria, but even Sodom.

Ezekiel's work in effecting a compromise between the priestly and prophetic tendencies is shown by the presence of his teaching as to the importance of ceremonial law side by side in the same book with his endorsement and

[1] Ezek. xxxiii. [2] Ezek. xx. 33-44. [3] Ezek. xxxvi. 25-31.
[4] *C.B.S.*, lii. [5] Ezek. xvi. 53-63; *cf.* Isa. xix. 18-25.

repetition of the ethical and spiritual teaching of the older prophets. He is the first of the prophets to lay stress on the Sabbath,[1] the distinction between clean and unclean, profane and sacred. He first idealises[2] the Temple, and gives to its services and priesthood a leading place in the new Israel, or, as we should say, in Messianic times. These doctrines are virtually summed up in his statements about the sanctity, sacredness, or holiness of Israel; *i.e.*, its consecration to Yahweh by a decent, seemly and orderly worship conducted by priests duly qualified in physique, training and character. The ceremonial law, of course, was not new; Ezekiel has much in common with Deuteronomy and the Law of Holiness, and his code is substantially a revision of older customs and traditions. Neither was the compromise new, it had already been promulgated in Deuteronomy, and ratified in solemn covenant by Josiah and the people. But in the Book of Ezekiel this compromise receives the seal of prophetic authority in the name of Yahweh and through the mouth of an inspired teacher who exercised a decisive influence on the spiritual destinies of Israel.

We may add two or three characteristic features of Ezekiel's teaching which hardly fall under the two main heads. He has the remarkable idea that God gave Israel evil statutes as a punishment for their sin;[3] he shows a keen interest in the circumstances of foreign nations, the commerce of Tyre and the fertility of Egypt,[4] and in his hands we can discern a marked advance in the importance assigned to angelic ministries.[5] His work also

[1] Jer. xvii. 19-27 is probably post-exilic. [2] Ezek. xl.-xlviii.
[3] Ezek. xx. 25. [4] Ezek. xxvi.-xxxi. [5] Ezek. i., ix.

marks the beginning of the transition from prophecy to Apocalyptic; he not only describes the establishment of the renewed Israel in Palestine under Messianic conditions, but he also depicts in a more remote time the invasion of the barbarian hordes of Gog and his allies, and their overthrow on the mountains of Israel.[1]

[1] Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPHET OF THE RESTORATION.

Isaiah xl., xli., xlii. 10-xlviii., xlix. 14-l. 3, li. 1-lii. 12, liv., lv.[1]

THE whole tenor of these passages shows that they were written towards the end of the Babylonian Captivity; probably not long before B.C. 540. More than forty years had elapsed since the fall of Jerusalem, and about thirty years since the close of Ezekiel's ministry.[2] During the interval faith had been kept alive through the memory of the teaching of Ezekiel and Jeremiah and their predecessors; the records of the prophetic teaching had been studied, edited and copied. As the Jews were shut out from ordinary ecclesiastical and political activity, the patriotic enthusiasm of the faithful was largely concentrated on the literature, and the ancient laws and annals were copied afresh in new and enlarged editions. We have few explicit statements as to the religious life of Israel during the captivity, but the surviving literature

[1] The title *Second Isaiah* is often given to this group of passages or to the whole of Isa. xl.-lv., more commonly to Isa. xl.-lxvi.

[2] According to the dates given in *Ezekiel* the latest sections of that book are the Constitution for the New Israel, xl.-xlviii., B.C. 572, and the passage on Egypt, B.C. 570.

and the later development of Judaism show the tenacity with which the exiles clung to the faith of Israel.

As far as the Babylonian Jews were concerned the worship of Yahweh had become identified with Revealed Religion as taught by the prophets. Their authority had been vindicated by the fate of Samaria, of Assyria and of Judah. Moreover, the exile had been a time of sifting; many Jews who were slight and worldly forsook Israel in its dark days, and became merged in the surrounding heathenism, so that as the years went on the Jewish community in Babylon became purified and exalted, possessed by a more passionate loyalty to the God who was the rallying point of their national hopes. In other words, Israel was becoming a Church.

As yet, however, there was no idea of any permanent separation of religion from politics; a cardinal article of faith was the restoration of Israel in Palestine as a nation; and the Jews were keenly alive to the possible bearing of international politics on their hopes. Throughout this period there was an exciting instability in the state of affairs; the balance of power in the Israelite world had never recovered from the shock sustained through the collapse of Assyria. For the moment Babylon succeeded Nineveh as the supreme power in Western Asia; but a series of events suggested that another more sweeping revolution was imminent. The New Chaldean Empire was largely the creation of Nebuchadnezzar; and his death in B.C. 561 prepared the way for its fall, soon after the star of Cyrus[1] rose on the political horizon and bid fair to outshine all other luminaries; his victories over Astyages of Media[2] and Crœsus of Lydia[3] promised even

[1] King of Persia, B.C. 558. [2] B.C. 550. [3] B.C. 546.

greater triumphs. The Jewish exiles watched the career of the conqueror from the East; he seemed about to change the face of the world. What would the new order bring to Yahweh's Chosen People?

The answer is given in these chapters, whose contents clearly indicate that they were composed in the closing years of the Exile; Jerusalem and its Temple, together with the cities of Judah are in ruins;[1] those addressed are exiles in Babylonia;[2] Cyrus is introduced without explanation or description as a great conqueror well known to both the prophet and his audience;[3] and the writer is preoccupied with Babylon, its attitude towards God's people and its coming doom.[4] The chapters are written from the standpoint of the Exile, and do not suggest that the author is living in some other period.

Contents.

The following is a brief survey of the contents of the "Second Isaiah". They fall naturally into two divisions, xl.-xlviii. and xlix.-lv. The first division begins[5] by declaring the Divine purpose to comfort Jerusalem because she has borne the full punishment of her sins; Yahweh is about to bring back the exiles. He is unique and supreme, the Ruler of the universe; the nations are as nothing before Him, and what are images! He is the Creator of earth and heaven; He brings the princes of the earth to nothing. Why then should Israel say that her cause is forgotten? Yahweh does not become weary; His purposes are inscrutable; He can give strength when natural resources fail.

[1] Isa. xliv. 26, xlix. 17-21. [2] Isa. xlviii. 20, lii. 11.
[3] Isa. xliv. 28, xlv. 13.
[4] Isa. xliii. 14, xlvii. 1-5, xlviii. 14-20. [5] Isa. xl. f.

The world is ringing with the exploits of a great conqueror from the East. Yahweh raised him up. To what end? Is not Israel the chosen servant of Yahweh? Surely then Yahweh will deliver him, he need not fear. In the hands of Yahweh, Israel shall be a sharp threshing instrument to crush its enemies, a fan to scatter them. For His thirsty people Yahweh will make the wilderness a wooded land with streams and springs.

As for the gods of the heathen, they are not to be feared, they have neither strength nor knowledge. If they have, let them show it. The conqueror whom Yahweh has raised up and announced is on his way to subdue the oppressors of Israel; no heathen god can point to any similar achievement.

The remaining chapters of this division repeat and amplify the topics of the opening section. Yahweh comes to deliver His people, in spite of apparently insurmountable obstacles, in spite of the heathen powers and their images, in spite of the fear and unbelief of Israel, His servant.[1] He alone is God; the futility of idols is shown by the material out of which they are made, and the process by which they are manufactured.[2] Let Israel rejoice that He is forgiven and redeemed.[3]

Then comes the climax of the first half of the work. Yahweh, the Creator, the inspirer of true prophecy expressly declares that Jerusalem, the Temple, and the cities of Judah shall be rebuilt, and speaks of Cyrus by name as His shepherd and His anointed, through whom

[1] Isa. xlii. 10-xliv. 5.

[2] Isa. xliv. 6-20. The Servant passages are reserved for separate treatment.

[3] Isa. xliv. 21-23.

Yahweh will subdue nations and kings that Israel may be delivered. Yahweh is the only God, the maker of light and darkness, of peace and calamity. Who can hinder His purposes. As for Bel and Nebo, the gods of Babylon, they shall soon be captives; they cannot protect themselves, far less deliver their worshippers.[1] Babylon shall go into captivity, in spite of her luxury and commerce, her wisdom and science, and her manifold enchantments.[2] Israel, indeed, has been guilty of many sins, and is still obstinate and unbelieving, yet for His name's sake, Yahweh will deliver His people. They may now flee from Babylon, a way will be made for them through the desert. Yet "There is no peace, saith Yahweh, for the wicked".[3]

The latter half[4] is written in the same spirit, and delivers substantially the same message; but the tone on the whole is brighter, more assured and restful. The polemic against idols is not renewed, and with it the mention by name of the conqueror Cyrus and of Babylon is dropped.

In the opening section[5] Yahweh combats the doubts and misgivings of Israel. In spite of the long-drawn-out miseries of the last days of Jerusalem and of the many years of exile, Yahweh had not forgotten His people. The might of their oppressors should not hinder their deliverance, nay, the nations and their kings should be-

[1] Isa. xliv. 24 - xlvi. 13. [2] Isa. xlvii. [3] Isa. xlviii.

[4] Isa. xlix.-lv. (Servant passages excepted as before). These chapters are sometimes regarded as not strictly part of the same work as xl.-xlviii., but as a sequel composed either by the same or another author; *cf. B.I.*, p. 187.

[5] Isa. xlix. 14 - l. 3.

come the humble servants of their former victims. No one has any rights over Israel which can stand in the way of God's gracious purposes. The Exile was God's punishment of His people's sin; and He, the ruler of earth and heaven, can redeem them.

Once more,[1] in a more joyous strain, the prophet announces the coming deliverance, and seeks to strengthen the feeble and hesitating faith of his hearers. Let them remember Yahweh's gracious dealings in the days of old, the blessings bestowed on Abraham, the marvels of the Exodus. Earth and heaven may vanish away, but God's faithfulness abides for ever and assures the deliverance of Israel. Why should they fear men, when Yahweh the Creator of heaven and earth is their champion. Their tribulations are a thing of the past; it is the turn of their enemies to suffer: "I have taken out of thine hand the cup of staggering, even the bowl of the cup of my fury; thou shalt no more drink it again: and I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee".[2] Now Yahweh hath bared His holy arm in the eyes of all nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see how God delivers His people.[3] They may depart from Babylon at their leisure, not in hasty flight, as when their fathers escaped from Egypt; no mere pillar of fire and smoke guides and protects them; Yahweh Himself will go before them, and the God of Israel will be their rearguard.[4]

Again the prophet renews his promises and his appeals. Zion has been desolate and solitary as a forsaken wife; but Yahweh Cebaoth, her husband, will be her Redeemer.[5]

[1] Isa. li. 1 - lii. 12. [2] Isa. li. 22. [3] Isa. lii. 10.
[4] Isa. lii. 11 f. [5] *Go'el.*

Her future shall be more glorious than her past: "thou shalt spread abroad on the right hand and on the left, and thy seed shall possess the nations". She need not fear any new calamities like the Captivity. That has been a unique experience, like the Flood: "As I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee".[1] Henceforward the Divine protection ensures her peace and prosperity. Let God's people trust in Him and forsake their sins, and He will assuredly pardon them, and fulfil His gracious promises. "For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace; the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle tree; and it shall be to Yahweh for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."[2]

These prophecies might be cited as a striking illustration of the saying—

The world knows nothing of its greatest men.

In them the Old Testament Revelation reaches its climax; yet they are anonymous, and we are not in a position to make even a plausible conjecture as to the name of their author. Their form shows that they were from the first literary compositions, probably read aloud or recited from memory by their composer or his disciples, and also circulated as leaflets or pamphlets. Perhaps the whole set were written continuously and published together; but it is quite as probable that they were com-

[1] Isa. liv. 9. [2] Isa. lv. 12, 13.

posed and published in rapid succession, and then collected into a single work, so that they might be roughly compared to a series of weekly sermons, lectures, or newspaper articles subsequently published in book form.

Author.

The author belonged to the new generation of Jews who had been born and had grown up in exile in Babylonia.[1] Already the old dispensation was a sacred memory, and distance lent enchantment to the Temple, to Jerusalem, and to the land of Israel. As he grew to manhood, the future prophet studied the traditions, history, laws, and prophetical writings of his people; and, untrammelled by the sordid realities which had saddened Isaiah and Jeremiah, he gloried in the lofty ideals of the inspired literature of Israel. The sins which kindled the indignation of former prophets were a reminiscence of ancient history, slight and dim compared to the poignant present experience of national ruin, and of the suffering and humiliation of exile. The Jews in Babylonia had, indeed, sins of their own, but these seemed venial compared with the cruel wrong done to them by their oppressors. In ancient Israel the prophets had been preoccupied by the crimes of the national government and the native aristocracy, but now "the throne of wickedness, . . . which framed mischief by statute,"[2] was seen on a much vaster scale in

[1] These chapters are dated towards the close of the Exile by most recent critics, *e.g.*, Dr. Int.[6], p. 231; Du., p. xiii.; Kau., p. 96; Mar., p. xv.; Skinner, p. l.; *G.A.S.*, p. 20. Ch., *P.B.*, p. 131, assigns xl.-xlviii. to this period, xlix.-lv. to the time of Ezra. The place of composition is usually held to be Babylonia, *e.g.*, Kau., Skinner, *G.A.S.*, Ch., but Du. prefers Phœnicia and Mar. (after Ew.) Egypt.

[2] Ps. xciv. 20.

the Chaldean administration, and Jewish superstition seemed trivial compared to the magnificent idolatry of Babylon.

This brief survey of the situation will have prepared us for the main points of the prophet's teaching. The Jews asked, what did the victorious advance of Cyrus mean for the Chosen People and the Sacred Land of Yahweh. The prophet replied that Yahweh had raised up Cyrus and given Babylon and the nations into his hand, that He might restore Israel to Palestine and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple.[1] To this end Cyrus was Yahweh's Anointed,[2] the divinely appointed King, the earthly vicegerent of God. To this end, too, Babylon was to be degraded from the supremacy of the East, and become a conquered, subject city; while its impotent deities would share its ruin and humiliation.[3] This great deliverance had become possible because the sufferings of the Exile had atoned for the sins of Israel. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her punishment is accepted; that she hath received at the hand of Yahweh double for all her sins."[4] Now, therefore, the captives, reconciled to God, released by Cyrus, His chosen instrument, were to return in triumph to Palestine, led by their Divine Shepherd. A smooth and level road would be miraculously prepared for Yahweh and His people, the valleys would be filled in, and the hills levelled, the crooked would be made straight, the rough places plain, and the Glory of Yahweh would

Teaching.

[1] Isa. xli. 25, xliv. 28 - xlv. 5, xlviii. 14, 15.

[2] Isa. xlv. 1; Anointed = *māshîah*, the original of Messiah.

[3] Isa. xlvi. 1, 2, xlvii., xlviii. 14.

[4] Isa. xl. 1, 2.

be made manifest to all.[1] Fountains would spring up and streams would flow through the waterless deserts, and forests would appear as if by magic to offer their grateful shade to the returning pilgrims.[2] They should pass unscathed through terrible dangers: "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee".[3] The return was to be a new and greater exodus.[4] The pilgrims would return from the four quarters of the world.[5]

The prophet is chiefly interested in the Restoration as the great event of the immediate future; the new dispensation which it was to inaugurate is only sketched in a vague and fragmentary fashion. Israel is forgiven and completely restored to favour with God. "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins."[6] The Divine Presence is with Israel to strengthen and bless the Chosen Servant of God: "Thou art my servant I have chosen thee and not cast thee away; fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee".[7] Again and again God addresses Israel as His Servant and His Chosen. Yahweh is the King of Israel and "his Redeemer".[8] The love of God for Israel is set forth in

The New Israel.

[1] Isa. xl. 3-11. [2] Isa. xli. 17-20.
[3] Isa. xliii. 2; *cf.* also xliii. 15-21, xliv. 3, 4, xlix. 9-11, 22-26, lv. 12, 13.
[4] Isa. xlviii. 21, li. 10. [5] Isa. xliii. 6, xlix. 12.
[6] Isa. xliv. 22; *cf.* lv. 7. [7] Isa. xli. 9, 10.
[8] Isa. xliv. 6; *cf.* xli. 21.

striking figures: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands."[1] "Thy Maker is thy husband." Zion or Israel in captivity has been as a forsaken wife, no better than a widow; but now she is to enjoy all her rights: "with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith Yahweh thy Redeemer . . . the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall My covenant of peace be removed".[2]

Yet the pardon and love of God are not due to any merit on the part of Israel; the prophet speaks strongly of the sins of his fellow-countrymen.[3] Like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, he teaches that God redeems Israel "for His name's sake". "For My name's sake will I defer Mine anger . . . for Mine own sake will I do it."[4] Yahweh's Servant, Israel, is blind and deaf, but Yahweh works "for His righteousness' sake," that He may be self-consistent; loyal to His own character, purpose, and promises.[5]

The home of the New Israel is Judah; Jerusalem and its Temple are to be rebuilt; the other cities of Judah are to be restored; the waste land will again be cultivated,[6] and will be occupied by a teeming population. The exiles will return in such great numbers that the land "will

[1] Isa. xlix. 15, 16. [2] Isa. liv. 8, 10. [3] *Cf.* below, p. 48.

[4] Isa. xlviii. 9, 11; *cf.* lii. 5, xliii. 25.

[5] Isa. xlii. 18-20, xlv. 23; *cf.* however xl. 1, and p. 38, a somewhat different view.

[6] Isa. xliv. 26-28, li. 3.

be too strait for its inhabitants".[1] Israel shall dwell in peace under the Divine protection, and shall learn Divine truth: "All thy children shall be taught of Yahweh, and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression, for thou shalt not fear; and from terror, for it shall not come near thee."[2] This new order is to be eternal.[3]

It is noteworthy that though we do read of the restoration of Judah, the prophet is chiefly interested in Jerusalem; Zion and Jerusalem constantly stand for the whole people. The Northern Tribes are entirely ignored; Ephraim and Samaria are not mentioned, and there is no reference to their territory.

Israel and the World.

The unique relation of Israel to Yahweh implied religious or ecclesiastical exaltation, and therefore—according to ancient ideas—political supremacy. The oppressors of Israel are to be punished;[4] Gentile kings are to be the humble instruments of the return of the Jews.[5] Because the one true God is manifest in Zion, the Egyptians, Ethiopians and Sabeans are to come in chains as suppliants bringing their manufactures and their merchandise as tribute.[6] God will bring again the great days of David, when Israel dominated the neighbouring peoples. Only the new dominion shall be on a larger scale: "Thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and a nation that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of Yahweh thy God, and for the Holy One of Israel; for He hath glorified thee".[7]

[1] Isa. xlix. 19-21, liv. 1-3. [2] Isa. liv. 11-17.
[3] Isa. xlv. 17. [4] Isa. xlix. 26, li. 23.
[5] Isa. xlix. 22 f. [6] Isa. xlv. 14. [7] Isa. lv. 4, 5.

On the other hand, the nations will respect the sanctity of the Holy City: "There shall no more come unto thee the uncircumcised and the unclean".[1] These words need not mean that Gentiles would be altogether excluded from Jerusalem; but that they would only be admitted to do homage to Israel and Yahweh.

Unbelief amongst the Exiles.

The prophet's faith in this glorious future had to be maintained in the face of sin[2] and unbelief on the part of many of his fellow-exiles. Prolonged misfortune had made it difficult for the Jews to expect better times; it seemed as if Yahweh could not or would not help. There seemed no escape from the grip of Babylon: "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the captives of the terrible one be delivered".[3] The exiles were cowed; they feared "continually all the day because of the fury of the oppressor".[4] God seemed far off and indifferent, and Israel complained, "My way is hid from Yahweh, and God neglects to do me justice".[5] Hence the prophet constantly appeals to the might of Yahweh,[6] to His love for His people,[7] to the proofs of His love that He had given in time past, to Abraham,[8] and David,[9] and at the Exodus.[10] Again and again he bids Israel "Fear not".[11] He insists that Yahweh cannot abandon His people to which He is bound by so many ties; He is their Creator[12] and Father;[13] He has chosen[14] them. His favour is secured to them

[1] Isa. lii. 1. [2] Isa. xliii. 24, xlviii. 1. [3] Isa. xlix. 24, R.V. mg.
[4] Isa. li. 13; *cf.* li. 22. [5] Isa. xl. 27. [6] *Cf.* below, p. 56.
[7] *Cf.* above, p. 45. [8] Isa. xli. 8, li. 2. [9] Isa. lv. 3.
[10] Isa. xliii. 16, li. 9, 10. [11] Isa. xli. 10 and *passim*.
[12] Isa. xliii. 1. [13] Isa. xliii. 6, xlv. 11, "my sons".
[14] Isa. xli. 9, etc.

by "a covenant of peace," "an everlasting covenant,"[1] and by the oath of Yahweh.[2] Above all else, Yahweh styles Himself the *Go'el*,[3] "Redeemer" of Israel, the next kinsman, bound by the blood-bond to stand by his kinsfolk in life and to avenge their death. To an Oriental no other figure could so forcibly express the idea that Yahweh was absolutely certain to intervene on behalf of Israel; it implied that the redemption of Israel was His first and supreme duty.

The Appeal to Prediction

Unbelief, however, might still harden its heart against the prophet and ask why his assurances should be accepted. Hence to obtain credence for his predictions he appeals to the fulfilment of previous predictions inspired by Yahweh, though not apparently uttered by the prophet himself. It seems that some important events of recent times, probably victories of Cyrus, had been predicted in the name of Yahweh: "I have declared the former things from of old; yea, they went forth out of my mouth, and I showed them: suddenly I did them and they came to pass".[4]

Polemic against Heathen Gods.

This power of Yahweh to predict the future is a leading feature of the prophet's polemic against the gods of Babylon. The deliverance of Israel implied that Yahweh could overcome the mighty deities who were reverenced throughout Western Asia; that the God of a group of petty tribes could cope with the gods who had ruled the fortunes of great empires like Assyria and Chaldea; the gods of the conquerors who had blotted out Israel and Judah

[1] Isa. liv. 10, lv. 3. [2] Isa. liv. 9. [3] Isa. xli. 14, etc.
[4] Isa. xlviii. 3; *cf.* the whole passage, 1-11; also xliv. 8, xlvi. 10.

from among the nations and carried the peoples away into captivity. The prophet, on the ground of the successful predictions already referred to, insists that Yahweh knew the future as the gods of Babylon did not, and that therefore He was the only true God.[1] This contention is also supported by other arguments; the false gods are identified with their images; and the prophet urges that wood and stone and gold and silver are not to be compared with the Creator and Ruler of the Universe.[2] He is thus led to develop the doctrine of God, and to formulate monotheism more formally and explicitly than any of his predecessors. Yahweh is the one true God,[3] the Creator,[4] omnipotent,[5] omniscient,[6] eternal,[7] omnipresent,[8] governing all things by His Providence.[9] The idea of Yahweh as unique and supreme is also expressed in the titles "the Holy One,"[10] or "the Holy One of Israel,"[11] which the prophet borrows from Isaiah.

The deliverance and exaltation of Israel would reveal these truths to the Gentiles,[12] and lead them to seek the favour of Israel and its God. Not only so, but the prophet also discerns that monotheism implies an offer of salvation to the whole world.[13] "Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. By Myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from My mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto Me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."

[1] Isa. xli. 21-29, and *cf.* above, p. 49, *n.* 4.
[2] Isa. xl. 12-26, xlvi. 5-7.
[3] Isa. xl. 18, xliv. 6-9, etc.
[4] Isa. xl. 26, xliv. 24, etc.
[5] Isa. xl. 12-15.
[6] Isa. xlv. 21, xlvi. 10.
[7] Isa. xliv. 6.
[8] Isa. lii. 10.
[9] Isa. xli. 4.
[10] *Qādôsh*, Isa. xl. 25.
[11] Isa. xli. 14, etc.
[12] Isa. xlv. 14-17.
[13] Isa. xlv. 22, 23.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH.

Isaiah xlii. 1-4 (5-9); xlix. 1-6 (7-13); l. 4-9 (10, 11);[1] lii. 13-liii. 12.

THESE passages present some of the most knotty problems of Old Testament Introduction; almost everything is matter of controversy—date, authorship, relation to the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv., interpretation; almost every possible view has been held on each of these points. For the purpose of this work it is not necessary to discuss the various views in detail; a general statement will suffice. These passages form clearly defined sections; if they were removed and the remainder were read by some one who was not acquainted with Isaiah xl.-lv. in its present form, he would not discover that anything was missing. The passages also have in common features not found in the rest of these chapters, notably the description of the suffering, persecuted and martyred Servant of Yahweh as a person. If Isaiah xl.-lv. is a single work, these differ-

[1] The verses in brackets are considered by Cheyne to be links written to connect the "Servant passages" proper with the context in which they were inserted. Whether or no this view be adopted, it is convenient to treat these verses with the "Servant passages".

ences may have been intentionally introduced for the sake of emphasis. It is, however, more generally believed that the Servant passages are independent poems. This theory has many alternative forms; it is still possible that the poems, though independent, were the work of the author of the rest of these chapters; it is more probable that they were composed by some one else, and either appropriated by the author of Isaiah xl.-lv. or inserted by an editor. The Servant passages, in accordance with these various theories, have been dated before,[1] during,[2] or after[3] the Exile.

There is equal variety of opinion as to who or what is meant by the Servant of Yahweh. The theories are of three types: the Servant is an actual person, or an ideal person, or personifies a community. From a very early period[4] the passages have been regarded as Messianic, and this view was generally held until the rise of critical exegesis, and is still held by many.[5] More recently the Servant has been supposed to be Jeremiah[6] or some late post-exilic scribe.[7] But the view is gaining ground that

[1] Klostermann, *P.R.E.*, *Jesaia*, viii., 724; Ewald, *ap. C.B.S.*

[2] Driver, *Isaiah* (*Men of the Bible*), pp. 176 ff.; König, *Einleitung*, p. 325; Marti, *Isaiah*, p. 361; Skinner, *Isaiah*, p. lv. (doubtfully); G. A. Smith, *Exp. B.*

[3] Cheyne, *E.B.*, *Isaiah*, 2205; Duhm, *Isaiah*, xviii., B.C. 450-400.

[4] *E.g.*, the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel.

[5] G. A. Smith, *D.B.* (for lii. 13-liii.), Delitzsch. Driver, as above, combines the views that the Servant is Israel and that He is a Messianic ideal.

[6] The Servant is identified with "Jeremiah, or some unknown martyr-prophet," by "Grotius, Bunsen, and Ewald" (Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, Eng. tr., 1877, vol. ii., p. 303).

[7] Duhm, *Isaiah*, xviii.

the Servant is the personification of Israel.[1] If the Servant is a Person, He must be either ideal or idealised; the difference is not great; on the one hand, the picture of an ideal prophet, martyr, or Redeemer would necessarily borrow features from historical individuals; on the other, an idealised portrait of a real person would become a type and foreshadowing of the Messiah. Compare our Lord's identification of John the Baptist with the ideal figure of the resuscitated Elijah.[2]

The interpretation of these passages partly determines the view which must be taken as to their authorship; in the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv. the Servant is expressly identified with Israel.[3] If, therefore, the Servant is here a Person and not the nation, we seem compelled to conclude that the Servant passages were originally independent of their present context, and are not the work of the same author; and *vice versa*, if Isaiah xl.-lv. is a single work by one writer, the Servant must be Israel throughout. This conclusion also seems to be required by one of the Servant passages themselves. In xlix. 3 we read: "Thou art my Servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified"; but it is sometimes maintained that "O Israel" is a gloss.[4] It need hardly be said that Isaiah xl.-lv. is not necessarily a single work even if the Servant = Israel throughout.

At present at any rate the balance of evidence and the weight of authority seem to indicate that the Servant

[1] Cheyne, *P.B.*, *Isaiah*, p. 177, "the Genius of Israel"; Marti, *Isaiah*, p. 360; Skinner hesitates between an ideal Israel and an ideal Israelite (*Isaiah*, p. 237; *cf.* p. 39).

[2] Matt. xi. 14. [3] Isa. xli. 8, xliv. 2, etc.

[4] *E.g.*, Duhm, *in loco.*

passages are an exilic[1] work written by some one other than the author of the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv.; and that the Servant is Israel. We propose therefore to interpret them from this point of view.

Contents.

The contents of these passages are as follows. The first passage, xlii. 1-9,[2] follows the introductory statement of the main themes of Second Isaiah, and precedes their subsequent detailed development. The introductory statement concluded with the declaration: "When I look, there is no man; even among them there is no counsellor, that, when I ask of them, can answer a word. Behold, they are all vanity, their works are nought; their molten images are wind and confusion." Then, in what seems to have been originally the next section, Yahweh Himself "goes forth as a mighty man".[3]

The effect of the insertion is that when Yahweh looked in vain for "a man" or "counsellor," a prophet to declare His Revelation, He sent His chosen and inspired Servant. The Servant is a quiet teacher, patiently instructing the dull and encouraging the feeble and despondent, delivering

[1] The term "exilic" must be understood in an elastic sense, in which the Exile began with the first deportation of captives by Nebuchadrezzar in 597, and continued for some time after the first Return in 586.

[2] *Cf.* note 2, p. 52.

[3] Isa. xli. 28 f., xlii. 13; *cf.* lix. 16, Yahweh "saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor; therefore his own arm brought salvation unto him"; and lxiii. 5, "I looked and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore my own arm brought salvation unto me". The comparison suggests that the Servant passages had not yet been inserted in Second Isaiah when lvi.-lxvi. was composed.

men from the prison-house of error and despair. The Servant is the herald of a world-wide Revelation; the Gentiles are to learn true religion, "he shall bring forth judgment unto the Gentiles".[1] His successful persistence in this marvellous task is guaranteed by the support of Yahweh, the Creator of heaven and earth. The Servant shall persevere,[2] "till he have set judgment in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his revelation . . . he shall be a light to the Gentiles".

Finally the passage, declares the unique glory of Yahweh as the only source of true prediction.

The second passage xlix. 1-13, is inserted between the two main divisions of the Second Isaiah, a position which may indicate that the editor felt it had no special relevance to its new context. The connecting verses,[3] however, lead up fairly well to xlix. 14.

The Servant, who is now[4] expressly identified with Israel, again declares to the Gentile world[5] that Yahweh called him from the womb. But he has become discour-

[1] From the context "judgment" here means "the righteous principles and methods of the Divine government," true religion on its practical side.

[2] Note from R.V. the suggestion of the wording of verses 3 and 4. The Servant is patient of the infirmities of those to whom he ministers; but he does not, through this ministry, become subject to these infirmities himself. He is not subdued to what he works in; working amongst sinners, he does not become sinful; he is not overcome of evil, but overcomes evil with good.

[3] *Cf.* note, p. 51. The connexion is further improved by the "But" of the English Versions; which would be unnecessary in the original Second Isaiah, xlix. 14, following the end of xlviii., but is justifiable in the present context.

[4] Isa. xlix. 3. [5] Isles, peoples.

aged: "I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought and vanity". Yahweh again assures him that his mission is not merely to Israel, the nation is not merely elect for its own sake, but he is to be "a light to the Gentiles, the Divine salvation to the end of the earth".[1] The following connecting verses repeat the assurance that Yahweh will support His Servant and deliver His people.

The third passage, l. 4-11, follows verses[2] which appeal to the destructive might of Yahweh as a proof of His power to deliver Israel. The sequence is appropriate, as the passage declares that the Lord Yahweh will vindicate His Servant by punishing those who oppose and persecute him. The Servant himself is an assiduous disciple of his Divine Teacher; he patiently endures persecution, and perseveres doggedly in the teeth of opposition.

The connecting verses encourage the Servant's adherents to trust in Yahweh, and declare that his opponents will be punished; thus leading up to li. 1-3, which encourages the righteous to trust in the Divine promise.

In the fourth passage,[3] lii. 13 - liii. 12, the faith of Israel issues triumphant from its age-long ordeal, and declares its confidence in the Divine righteousness, in spite of the tragic experiences of life. The exultant notes with which the section opens and closes enable the editor to obtain an appearance of sequence and connexion with the verses between which it is inserted; but the poem as a whole is a vivid contrast to the cheerful optimism of the latter part of the Second Isaiah.

[1] Isa. xlix. 6. [2] Isa. l. 2, 3. [3] *Cf.* p. 52.

The theme is the exaltation of the humiliated Servant. We have seen him called to a most honourable task, the preaching of the Truth of God to the whole world; patiently persevering in his vocation in spite of unbelief, contumely, and persecution. Now he touches lower depths and rises to loftier heights. His sufferings are a wonder to all men; but his final glory is a greater marvel. Misfortune in every form had been with him throughout his career; feeble and unattractive in appearance, disfigured by disease, his claim to a Divine mission had seemed a futile imposture. Calamity and disease, perhaps even leprosy,[1] marked him out, it seemed, as a sinner, condemned and cursed by God. Later times, however, reading his history in the light of its sequel, saw in his agony a vicarious suffering borne for the salvation of the whole world: "Yahweh laid on him the iniquity of us all".[2]

The contempt and abhorrence of his contemporaries broke out into persecution, and at last he died the death of a criminal—in reality, he was a martyr, "he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth".[3]

But this life-long tragedy had been the working out of a Divine purpose; his life, both in his living and in his dying, had been provided by God as an atonement for the sins of the world. In a glorious resurrection the Servant of Yahweh shall take his place with mighty conquerors;

[1] נָגוּעַ מֻכֵּה אֱלֹהִים, R.V. "stricken, smitten of God," may well describe leprosy; so the Vulgate, a rendering which coupled with the Messianic interpretation did much for the humane treatment of lepers in the Middle Ages.

[2] Isa. liii. 6. [3] Isa. liii. 8, 9 are largely unintelligible.

and rejoice in the achievement of his mission, the redemption of the world.

This author also[1] had lived under circumstances which enabled him to idealise Israel as the Servant of Yahweh, *i.e.*, towards the end of the Exile, in some devout Jewish community. He also had been profoundly impressed by the spectacle of the great Gentile states with their teeming populations, their military power and material resources, and their brilliant civilisation; and yet had kept his faith in Yahweh, so that the Divine Revelation seemed a more precious possession for Israel than all the wealth, culture, and glory of Babylon. He was not moved to vindicate the claims of Yahweh; he took them for granted, probably because he usually lived amongst faithful believers. He is interested in the restoration of Israel, but this is not his main theme, because a more marvellous hope had dawned in his soul. He is quite vague as to the time and manner of that restoration, probably because these passages were written somewhat earlier than the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv., before the conquests of Cyrus had given definite shape to the hopes of the Jews.

Israel in exile, in the eyes of the author of the Servant passages, was a witness for God to the Gentiles, despised and persecuted, yet assured of ultimate triumph. He was not concerned with the sins of Israel in times gone by, but rather with the sufferings of faithful Israelites in his own days. Like Job he was perplexed by the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked. To the solution of this problem he applied the idea that Israel was God's witness. He idealises in a series of

[1] *I.e.*, like the author of the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv.

graphic pictures the character, the mission, and career of his people; everything is seen in the light of his great inspiration that Israel was to be "a light to the Gentiles," that God's "salvation may be unto the end of the earth".[1] To this end Israel suffers in captivity; its pain and humiliation are for the redemption of the world.[2]

These Servant poems must not be taken for an exhaustive and scientific interpretation of the history of Israel; but the prophet for the moment sees that history as the symbol of the great truth in which he is absorbed. Everything else is forgotten.

He thus expresses in the most striking fashion three supremely important doctrines: (i.) *Universalism*, the true religion, the religion of Yahweh, is for all the world; (ii.) *Vicarious Atonement*, the explanation of the sufferings of the righteous is that they endure in order that sinners may be saved;[3] (iii.) *The Mission of Israel to the Gentiles*, the election of Israel is not merely to privilege, but also to service; Israel is elect for the sake of the world.[4]

[1] Isa. xlix. 6. [2] Isa. liii.

[3] (i.) and (ii.) hold good equally if the Servant is regarded as the Messiah.

[4] The views as to the date, etc., of the Servant passages may be variously combined; *e.g.*, Smend holds that these sections were composed earlier than the rest of Isaiah xl.-lv. and by a different author. The Servant is Israel, but some features of the picture are drawn from the experiences of a saint and martyr of the period of Jeremiah (pp. 256 ff.).

CHAPTER V.

OTHER ANONYMOUS PROPHECIES OF THE EXILE.

Isaiah xiii. 1-xiv. 23, xxi. 1-10; Jeremiah l., li.; Zechariah ii. 6-13.

The Chaldean period possessed a group of great prophets in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the author or authors of the Prophecy of Restoration and of the poems on the Servant of Yahweh. Doubtless they had their associates and imitators; they no more stood alone than did Luther, Calvin, and Erasmus at the Reformation. A careful examination of the prophetical books discloses a number of passages varying in length from a verse to three or four chapters which are attributed to these unknown speakers or writers. It is often difficult to assign them to any exact date, or even to determine whether they fall into the period of the Exile, or into the Persian or the Greek period or even later; for many of them are brief; their contents are largely of a general character; and they contain much that is clearly imitation of older work. Here we shall deal with those only which are commonly regarded as exilic; leaving doubtful passages for a later

chapter.[1] The four prophecies dealt with in this chapter seem to indicate an exilic standpoint by their references to captivity and exile, their interest in Babylon, and their hopes of a return, and by the absence of any trace of the circumstances which followed the fall of Babylon and the establishment of the Persian supremacy in Western Asia.

The first section[2] consists of two poems on the Day of the Lord, with two additions. The poems may possibly be by different authors. The former poem, xiii. 2-22, begins with an apocalyptic picture of God's judgment on the world—the heavenly bodies are darkened, and earth and heaven are shaken[3]—and passes without any marked transition into a prediction of a complete and final destruction of Babylon by the Medes. The concluding verses of the section, xiv. 22, 23, deal with the same subject, and may be part of the poem. The second poem, xiv. 4b-21, describes the descent of the King of Babylon into Sheol. He is subjected to exceptional ignominy in that his corpse is cast forth unburied.[4] The close of the poem illustrates the profound impression made upon the Jews by the power and splendour of Babylon; the children are to be slain lest they should regain possession of the land and cover

Isaiah xiii. 1.-xiv. 23.

[1] The following are sometimes assigned to the Exile—Isa. xi. 10-16, xxiii., xxxiv., xxxv., Jer. xxiii. 1-8 (Stade, p. 295), and many other passages, some of which are noticed in the discussion of separate ctrines.

[2] Assigned to the Exile by Cheyne, *P.B.*, Duhm, *L.O.T.*, Marti, Skinner, G. A. Smith, *D.B.*, and others. In *E.B.* Cheyne adopts the view that xiv. 4b-21 originally referred to Sennacherib, Babylon in verse 4 being a mistake. He still, however, regards the poem as late.

[3] xiii. 10, 13. [4] xiv. 19, 20.

it with cities.[1] The two poems are connected by a short prophecy,[2] foretelling the restoration of the Israelites to their own land.

The second section[3] is a magnificent lyric in which the poet describes himself as overcome with horror at the news of a great catastrophe; a caravan has arrived announcing the fall of Babylon. It is implied that these are good tidings to the "threshed-out and down-trodden"[4] people of Yahweh; yet here again we see how fully the Jews realised the glory of the great Chaldean city. The poet almost forgets the wrongs of his people in his distress at the ruin of the fountain-head of Eastern civilisation.

Isaiah xxi. 1-10.

The third section[5] has been provided with a heading ascribing it to the fourth year of Zedekiah, and is followed by a short narrative—Jeremiah in the fourth year of Zedekiah made a copy of his prophecies against Babylon; gave it to a royal ambassador who was going on a mission to Babylon;

Jeremiah l. 1-li. 58.

[1] xiv. 21. [2] xiv. 1-4a.

[3] Assigned to the Exile by Cheyne, *E.B.*, Duhm, *L.O.T.*, p. 216, Marti, Skinner, G. A. Smith, *D.B.*, and others.

[4] Verse 10, *P.B.*

[5] It is generally held that this section is not the work of Jeremiah. It is ascribed to the close of the Exile by *L.O.T.*, p. 268; Buhl, *P.R.E.* The tendency of recent criticism is to assign it to a later period. Cornill regards it as one of the latest portions of *Jeremiah;* Giesebrecht regards it as post-exilic; Kautzsch dates it *c.* B.C. 400; Schmidt, *E.B.*, not before B.C. 150. It is possible, as Kautzsch suggests in *K.B.W.*, that it was constructed about 400, on the basis of *Jeremiah*, 2 *Isaiah* and other exilic oracles. We have dealt with it here because its ideas are substantially exilic, though its literary form may be later.

and bade him throw it into the Euphrates. The editor who combined the prophecy and the narrative, and prefixed the heading, intended the contents of this manuscript to be identified with Jeremiah l. 1 - li. 58.

The only authority for authorship by Jeremiah is the heading; and this is wrong as to the date, the contents of this prophecy show that it was not composed in the fourth year of Zedekiah. At that time the Temple was standing; Jeremiah was ministering to the Jews in Jerusalem;[1] and he was advising the Jews in Chaldea to settle down quietly and look forward to an exile of seventy years.[2] These chapters speak of the destruction of the Temple as an event of the past,[3] and urge the Jews to flee at once from Babylon.[4] Seeing, therefore, that the heading is mistaken as to the date, we may also set aside its testimony as to authorship, and follow the clear internal evidence in ascribing Jeremiah l., li., to a writer other than Jeremiah. The time indicated cannot be earlier than the close of the Exile, when the prophet had probably been dead for some years. As literature these chapters are inferior to the work of Jeremiah, from which they make large quotations. Finally they express a fierce hostility to Babylon to which there is no real parallel in the genuine utterances of Jeremiah.

This long oracle rings the changes on a few ideas which constantly recur; the imminent and final ruin of Babylon, which is to become a haunt of wild beasts, never again to be inhabited by men;[5] the escape of Israel from Babylon and its return to the Holy Land.[6]

[1] Jer. xxviii. 1. [2] Jer. xxix. [3] Jer. li. 11.
[4] Jer. l. 8, li. 6. [5] Jer. l. 11 ff., 39 f., li. 26, 29, 37, 41 ff.
[6] Jer. l. 4 f., etc.

God's people have been lost sheep, a prey to "all that found them"; and their enemies have alleged that they were justified in oppressing Israel because of its sins against Yahweh.[1] The fall of Babylon is a punishment inflicted on account of the evil done to Zion,[2] a view hardly homogeneous with Jeremiah xxv. 9, which speaks of Nebuchadrezzar as the Servant of Yahweh sent by Him to execute His judgment on Israel and its neighbours.[3]

This passage, like the preceding,[4] illustrates the bitter resentment of the exiles towards the Chaldeans; a feeling which was doubtless justified by the treatment which they had undergone.

The *fourth* section has been inserted in our Book of Zechariah; but its standpoint is that of Babylon and the Exile.[5] Zion dwells with the daughter of Babylon and is urged to escape. Yahweh promises that He will return to Zion, that He will "inherit Judah as His portion, and shall yet choose Jerusalem". The passage is remarkable for the declaration that "many nations shall join themselves to Yahweh in that day, and shall be My people".

Zechariah ii. 6-13.

[1] Jer. l. 6, 7; *cf.* l. 33 f., li. 51. [2] Jer. li. 24 f., etc.
[3] *Cf.* Giesebrecht and the present writer's *Jeremiah*, *Exp. B.*
[4] See above, pp. 61 ff. [5] So most recent critics.

CHAPTER VI.

HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH.

Haggai, Zechariah i. 1-ii. 5, iii. 1-viii. 23.[1]

MANY of the hopes expressed in Isaiah xl.-lv. were speedily fulfilled; Cyrus continued his victorious advance; in B.C. 538 he took Babylon; the Chaldean empire collapsed; and Cyrus established the dominion of Persia throughout Western Asia. His successor Cambyses also subdued Egypt. The Persian empire endured for two centuries.

No doubt faithful Jews, already excited by the utterances of their prophets, welcomed the success of Cyrus as a manifestation of the omnipotence of Yahweh, and of His grace towards Israel. But it is difficult to determine how far the expectations aroused by Isaiah xl.-lv. were fulfilled, for our information as to the years immediately following the fall of Babylon is meagre, obscure, and—according to some critics—untrustworthy.

A little later, B.C. 520-516, the mists clear away for a brief space, and reveal Jerusalem once more inhabited by

[1] For Zech. ii. 6-13, see above, p. 62; and for Zech. ix.-xiv., see below, chap. x.

an Israelite community, led by a native governor, Zerubbabel, and a high priest, Joshua ; ministered to by prophets, Haggai and Zechariah ; and occupied with the rebuilding of the Temple. Zerubbabel was a prince of the ancient royal house, grandson of Jeconiah.[1] Palestine is now a province of the Persian empire, and the foreign rule is accepted as part of the order of nature ; Haggai and Zechariah date their prophesies by the regnant years of the Persian kings. The Jewish community is poor and distressed, suffering from the effects of drought and failure of crops, and harassed by hostile neighbours.[2] But what happened in the interval between B.C. 538 and B.C. 520 is not altogether certain. Ezra i.-iv. states that after the fall of Babylon, Cyrus issued a decree ordering that the Temple at Jerusalem should be rebuilt, and permitting the Jewish exiles to return to Palestine. Accordingly 42,360 returned to Jerusalem, accompanied by 7,337 slaves and 200 " singing men and singing women ". On their arrival they rebuilt the altar of burnt offerings and instituted a daily sacrifice. Next year they solemnly laid the foundation of the Temple. Then the mixed population, half Jewish, half heathen, of Samaria asked to be associated in this work ; but the Jews refused. Whereupon the Samaritans " weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counsellors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, King of Persia, even until the reign of Darius, King of Persia " ;[3] *i.e.*, they interfered with the work of rebuilding, and induced the Persian government to sanction their interference.

[1] 1 Chron. iii. 17 ff.

[2] Hag. i. 6, 9 ff., ii. 16, 17 ; Zech. viii. 10 ff. [3] Ezra iv. 4, 5.

Within the last thirty years the historicity of these statements has been challenged;[1] it has been maintained that there was no return of the Jews under Cyrus; and that the community which rebuilt the Temple consisted of the remnant who had remained in Judah after the fall of Jerusalem and the captivity of the bulk of the people. The main ground for this view is that Haggai and Zechariah neither mention nor imply any return of exiles from Babylon.

The view in question has met with some acceptance; but criticism tends to maintain the substantial accuracy of the narrative;[2] many exiles did return after the fall of Babylon; these returned exiles formed the new Jewish community, and rebuilt the Temple.

The two alternatives presented by this controversy suggest two very different views of the history. By reconstructing both we shall best show what issues are involved, and may help the reader to judge which theory is more probable.

We may begin with the theory which rejects the narrative in Ezra i.-iv. The last we heard of the Jews left behind in Judah was that most of them fled to Egypt shortly after the fall of Jerusalem,[3] *i.e.*, about B.C. 586. What happened then in the next sixty or seventy years to provide us with a Jewish community in and about Jerusalem, who could rebuild the Temple in B.C. 520-516? No doubt even after the last organised bodies of Jews had

[1] Chiefly by Kosters, *Het Herstel*, etc., German trans.

[2] So Meyer, *Entstehung*, etc., and others. The English reader will find a careful discussion of this matter in G. A. Smith's *Book of the Twelve*, ii., 204 ff.

[3] Jer. xliii.

left the country, many remained in hiding in the more remote districts, and many more had taken refuge with neighbouring tribes. It was soon clear that no Jewish state could be re-established which would give the least trouble to Babylon. In time the vigilance of the Chaldeans would be relaxed, and Jews would drift back to their old homes from their hiding-places in Judah, from the Philistine and Phœnician cities, from Moab, Ammon, and Edom, and even from Egypt, Arabia, and the remoter parts of Syria. As the troubles of the Chaldeans increased and the fall of Babylon became imminent, Palestine would be left to its own devices; and the Jews might venture to occupy Jerusalem, and build new homes from its ruins. The final success of Cyrus might encourage them to renew their national worship and rebuild the Temple; their brethren in Babylon might obtain for them formal permission from the Persian government. Amongst the refugees who had returned to Judah or the remnant who remained there, priests and nobles would be found, and even members of the royal house. From amongst these the remnant made a certain Zerubbabel their leader, and a priest Joshua was entrusted with the supervision of public worship. These appointments were confirmed by the Persian authorities. The remnant at Jerusalem would be familiar with the religious traditions of Israel; more especially those who had always remained in the land would have their interest and memory rendered more tenacious by local associations. On the other hand, refugees returning from Egypt and other countries, and perhaps even from Babylon, would bring with them some leaven of foreign influence. The community would naturally possess the ancient Israelite literature, and might

well have received from Babylon either the writings of Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah or some report of their teaching. Under these various influences the new Israel arose and entered upon its career as the instrument of Divine Revelation—if we set aside the narrative in Ezra i.-iv.

Some such development might very well have taken place in seventy years; and, apart from *Ezra*, it would not be hopelessly inconsistent with the meagre information we possess as to the fortunes of the Jews in this period. Many difficulties might doubtless be suggested; it might be urged, for instance, that the remnant in the land would be too feeble to maintain itself against the hostility of the neighbouring tribes. We know that during the Exile the south of Judah was occupied by the Edomites,[1] and it seems hardly likely that they would have tolerated the gradual reconstitution of an Israelite community in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. But such objections are not necessarily fatal to the theory. On the other hand, this reconstruction of the history is not very convincing; and all things considered, the balance of probability lies with the older and familiar view, to which we will now turn.

According to this view, the new Israel, the post-exilic community at Jerusalem, was continuous as a society with the old Israel. The captives at Babylon included most of the royal house, the priests, the nobles, and ruling classes, and the *élite* of the working population; in other words, the best representatives of the various elements of the ancient Jewish state, with perhaps an exception.

[1] *E.B.*, Edom, col. 1186.

Probably the purely agricultural population, the inhabitants of the outlying districts, were not to be found in large numbers among the exiles. The captives carried with them the national literature; and the literary activity of the Exile shows that there was a class of students or scribes amongst the exiles. In our previous chapters we have seen that the most characteristic feature of the religious life of Israel, the succession of inspired prophets, was worthily maintained in Chaldea. Moreover, the literature of the period was occupied with the history of the nation, and with the ritual of its worship. Although the political life of Israel and its public religious services were in abeyance, the other streams of the national life continued to flow, though with diminished volume. Hence, when the opportunity came, some fifty thousand Jews, the spiritual successors of the best elements of the old Israel, returned to found the new community. They were armed with the full authority of the Persian government, and were accompanied by a Persian official, Sheshbazzar.[1] They were provided with considerable resources. On their arrival in Judea, their numbers and the prestige of Sheshbazzar, who was doubtless accompanied by a Persian escort, secured them from interference until they were sufficiently established to be able to hold their own. Apparently there was no appreciable remnant of Jews about Jerusalem to welcome them or co-operate with them; the only inhabitants of the land of whom we

[1] Ezra i. 8. Some have supposed that Sheshbazzar was a Jew, possibly Zerubbabel under another name, or the Shenazzar of 1 Chron. iii. 18; but the form of the name and the general circumstances render it probable that he was a non-Jewish official of the Persian government (Stade, etc., *apud D.B.*).

read are the hostile Gentile tribes, and the half-heathen Samaritans with whom the returned exiles refused to associate. The new community was comparatively homogeneous; they had all come under the influence of the splendour and culture of Babylon; they had all maintained their faith in Yahweh in the face of the prestige of Merodach and Ishtar; and they had all sacrificed their interests in Chaldea and undertaken a tedious and perilous journey that they might worship the God of their fathers in His ancient home. Their first care was to rebuild His Temple.

They were united by many close ties with the faithful Jews who remained in Babylon; so that the two societies in Palestine and in Chaldea were two branches of one community, whose experience and history had been the same up to the fall of Babylon.

It will be obvious that the two theories, that which follows Ezra i.-iv. and that which rejects the narrative in those chapters, give two very different views of the history and character of the post-exilic community in Babylon. According to the latter view, the bulk of the Palestinian Jews had remained in uninterrupted or almost uninterrupted relations with the land of Judah; they had been continuously under the influence of its local associations; they had no experience of the civilisation of the lands on the Euphrates and the Tigris; and they had not shared in the vigorous intellectual and religious life of the exiles, or profited by the personal ministry of Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah. Apart from other considerations, the story told in Ezra i.-iv. seems more probable in its main outlines than this alternative. It may indeed be urged that the comparatively numerous and wealthy body described in these chapters, reinforced by the authority of

the suzerain, would have been able to complete the Temple at once, and would not so soon have been brought to a standstill by their hostile neighbours, nor would they have fallen in a few years into the distress and the religious apathy described by Haggai. But there is little force in such objections; fifty or sixty thousand is not a large population for Jerusalem and its district, and the numbers may be exaggerated. As to the support of the Persian government, Eastern rulers are often fickle. Even if Cyrus continued well disposed towards the Jews, he may have been preoccupied with other affairs; and the adversaries of the Jews may have bribed or cajoled some local governor.

Thus in attempting to realise the conditions under which Haggai and Zechariah prophesied, we may safely follow the general lines of the narrative in *Ezra*. When Persia had become mistress of Western Asia, an organised body of exiles returned to Palestine, and established a restored Jewish community in and about Jerusalem. So far events had fulfilled the predictions of the prophets, and especially of the Second Isaiah. It is true that there were many predictions which had not been fulfilled, and few, if any, had been verified in all their details; but Old Testament doctrine did not require exact and invariable fulfilment.[1] The devout Jew, however, looking back over the last two centuries, would perceive that the general course of history had been according to the words of the prophets. The ten tribes had been carried away captive; Assyria had disappeared from among the nations; Jerusalem and the Temple had been laid in ruins, and the

[1] *Cf.* chap. x.

Jews carried captive to Chaldea; Babylon had fallen in its turn; there had been a return of exiles, and Jerusalem was again inhabited.

But surely all these acts of God were only pledges of greater things to come; the Second Isaiah had also declared that Jerusalem should be too strait for the exiles who were to flock back to her;[1] that the cities of Judah should be built, and its waste places inhabited.[2] The Lord Yahweh had said to Zion, "kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their faces to the earth, and lick the dust of thy feet";[3] and again, "the labour of Egypt and the merchandise of Ethiopia, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine; in chains shall they come over".[4] Enthusiasts at Jerusalem felt that their little community was the beginning of this wonderful new Israel with its political and ecclesiastical glory, its material prosperity and religious exaltation. Light had come to them; but surely only the dimness of a grey dawn which was to brighten to meridian splendour. In this spirit they renewed the sacrificial worship; laid the foundation of the Temple; and excluded the half-heathen Samaritans from their fellowship. But their skies soon clouded over; the despised Samaritans stopped the building of the Temple; and a succession of troubles great and small overwhelmed the Jews. It seemed clear that the Divine favour was withdrawn. Was there some new Achan in the camp; some new Manasseh amongst the leaders of Israel?

[1] Isa. xlix. 14-21. [2] Isa. xliv. 26.
[3] Isa. xlix. 23. [4] Isa. xlv. 14.

Enthusiasm gave place to dispirited apathy, and life became a half-hearted struggle with sordid cares. "The like collapse," writes G. A. Smith,[1] "has often been experienced in history when bands of religious men, going forth, as they thought, to freedom and the immediate erection of a holy commonwealth, have found their unity wrecked and their enthusiasm dissipated by a few inclement seasons on a barren and a hostile shore."

Before long, however, the Jews were roused from their stupor by a series of revolutions which seemed to promise another transformation of the international system of Western Asia. In B.C. 529 Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses, who added Egypt to the Persian empire, and committed suicide in 522. At his death the throne was seized by a Magian impostor, Gaumata, who personated Cambyses' dead brother, Bardis or Smerdis. But the fraud was soon discovered; Gaumata was slain by a band of seven nobles, who placed upon the throne one of their number, Darius I. Hystaspis. These events had disturbed and excited the whole empire, and the accession of a new king, the founder of a new dynasty, was the signal for the revolt of Babylon and most of the dependent states. It seemed as if Persia was to follow Assyria and Babylon. As of old, the hopes of the Jews were stirred by the misfortunes of the supreme power; the fall of Babylon had brought a first instalment, so to speak, of the promised Messianic blessings; the fall of Persia might complete the tale. Once more political unrest was the occasion of prophetic activity, and Haggai and Zechariah appeared upon the scene with new assurances that the Messianic era was close at hand.

[1] *Minor Prophets*, ii., 235.

Since the Return some changes had taken place in the authorities at Jerusalem; the Persian Sheshbazzar had disappeared, and the Davidic prince Zerubbabel was governor of Jerusalem as representative of the Persian king. The organisation of the priesthood had been further developed by the institution of the office of High Priest, which was held by Joshua ben Jozadak.[1] The office may have been created to satisfy his ambition and afford scope for his ability, to the chagrin of Zerubbabel, whose authority was likely to suffer.

On the first of the sixth month of the second year of Darius, September, B.C. 520, at the feast of the New Moon, Haggai came forward with his first message. We know nothing of him but his name,[2] and what may be gathered from his few utterances. There is no reason to doubt that the report given by our book of his work and preaching is substantially correct. The prophet addressed himself specially to Zerubbabel and Joshua as the co-ordinate representatives of the people. Their misfortunes were a punishment for their sin in neglecting to rebuild the Temple. Then the people and their leaders "obeyed the voice of Yahweh and the words of Haggai, and Yahweh stirred up their spirit"; and in

Haggai i.

Stade, p. 313. In Ezra iii. 2, etc., Joshua is mentioned without any title: "Jeshua the son of Jozadak and his brethren the priests". In Hag. i. 1, etc., Zech. iii. 1, etc., he is regularly called "the high priest". The latter title does not appear in documents older than *Haggai;* the older formula is "the priest"—"Eli the priest," 1 Sam. i. 9; "Abiathar the priest," 1 Kings i. 19, etc. Doubtless in all times each of the more important sanctuaries had a numerous priesthood with a chief; but the office had not attained to the formal and emphatic recognition which it received after the Exile.

[2] The meaning of Haggai is uncertain.

three weeks they set to work on the Temple. But the scale of the new building was small and its adornments mean as compared with the Temple of Solomon. There were old men amongst the Jews who remembered the ancient sanctuary "in her first glory"; and these *laudatores temporis acti* discouraged the builders by telling them that their work was "as nothing in comparison". Thus, about four weeks later, on the twenty-first of the seventh month, October, at the Feast of Tabernacles, Haggai came forward with a second message. He bade the people and their leaders persevere; and promised that the political disturbances of the time would issue in a great "shaking" of "the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land . . . and all nations"; that then the wealth of the nations should come as tribute to the Temple; the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former; and it should abide in peace and security.

Haggai ii. 1-9.

Nevertheless there were no signs that devotion to the service of Yahweh was bringing about any improvement in material circumstances; and enthusiasm again flagged. Once more Haggai came to the rescue. He elicited from the priests a decision that uncleanness was more contagious than cleanness, a symbol of the truth that sin brought about consequences more speedily than righteousness.[1] The promised blessing had only been delayed; it should begin at once, "from this day will I bless you".[2] He added another word, addressed personally to Zerubbabel; he re-

Haggai ii. 10-23.

[1] So G. A. Smith.

[2] The exact meaning and reference of "from the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month" in ii. 18 is uncertain.

peated the promise that heaven and earth should be shaken and the heathen nations overthrown, and "in that day, saith Yahweh Çebāôth, will I take thee, O Zerubbabel, my servant, and will make thee as a signet, for I have chosen thee".

Haggai, therefore, was chiefly anxious to urge on the rebuilding of the Temple. It is not fair, however, to contrast such teaching with the more ethical and spiritual messages of the earlier prophets. The Temple was the supreme practical necessity for the religious life of the community; as M. Tony Andrée writes:[1] "Without a sanctuary Yahweh would have seemed a foreigner to Israel.[2] The Jews would have thought that He had returned to Sinai, the Holy Mountain; and that they were deprived of the temporal blessings which were the gifts of a God with a local habitation in their midst."[3] The chief argument on which Haggai relied was that the material prosperity of the people depended on their zeal for God; the distress was a sign that He was angry with them on account of their indifference to His worship. This reasoning is an application of the doctrine of Ezekiel and the Deuteronomic writers, that material conditions are an index to the moral and spiritual value of character and conduct. Haggai also follows earlier prophets in expecting the Messianic era, in the immediate future, as the sequel to the political troubles of his time. As in the case of his predecessors, his hopes are coloured by the circumstances of his ministry; the point on which he dwells is the future

The Teaching of Haggai.

[1] *Le Prophète Aggée*, p. 106. [2] *Étranger à Israel.*

[3] *Du Dieu résident.* The quotation has been slightly paraphrased; "a resident God" would sound irreverent to English ears.

glory of the Temple.[1] It is a new feature that he ventures to name a living contemporary, Zerubbabel, as the divinely chosen head of Israel in its coming glory; or, as we should say, as the Messiah.[2]

In Ezra vi. 14 Zechariah is associated with Haggai; the rebuilding of the Temple was due to their prophesying.

Zechariah.

Possibly our book is the only ground for this statement about Zechariah. It does not indeed contain express exhortations to build the Temple, but it is much occupied with the subject.[3] It is, however, also possible that Zechariah directly urged the rebuilding in utterances which have not been preserved in our book. Little more is known of him. His name is indeed significant and suggestive, "Yahweh remembers"; of Israelite names in the Old Testament, no other is borne by so many persons. It is probable that the prophet is the same as the Zechariah of the House of Iddo mentioned in Nehemiah xii. 16, in a list of priests; if so, he, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, was priest as well as prophet.

With one exception,[4] Zechariah i.-viii. are generally ascribed to Zechariah. The book begins with a brief general introduction, dated in the eighth month of the second year of Darius, *i.e.*, November, B.C. 520; so that he began his ministry while Haggai was prophesying. Zechariah appeals to the national experience. In former times Yahweh had sent prophets, and the people had refused to believe their message, or to repent in response to their preaching. Yet the threatened judgments had been executed, and Israel

Zechariah i. 1-6.

[1] Hag. ii. 6-9; *cf.* p. 76.
[2] Hag. ii. 21-23; *cf.* p. 76.
[3] Zech. iii. 7, vi. 13, viii. 9.
[4] Zech. ii. 6-13; see above, p. 62.

had had to acknowledge that Yahweh Çebāôth had dealt with them as He had thought to do, *i.e.*, according to the words of the ancient prophets. The Jews of Zechariah's time are exhorted to take warning by the example of their fathers. The application is not made in so many words; but it is sufficiently obvious. The Jews hesitated to believe and obey Haggai and Zechariah; let them learn from history that it was fatal to reject the prophets of Yahweh. Necessarily the real point at issue is taken for granted—were Haggai and Zechariah, true prophets? The verses are a claim that they were, or at any rate that Zechariah was.

The second portion of the book is a group of eight symbolic visions, given under the date of the twenty-fourth of the eleventh month of the second year of Darius, *i.e.*, January or February, B.C. 519. These visions are seen by night and are exhibited, so to speak, and interpreted by angels. These are dated two months after the last utterance of Haggai, and the first vision is a sequel to his teaching. Haggai had announced a "shaking" of nature and of the kingdoms of the world which was to be the prelude to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. The revolts at the accession of Darius had also encouraged the Jews to hope for such a "shaking"; but now Zechariah sees four angelic messengers who report to the Angel of Yahweh, "We have walked to and fro through the earth, and behold all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest".[1] Darius was quelling the various rebellions with unexpectedly rapid success; and men murmured that the promise made by

Zechariah i. 7-vi. 8.

[1] Zech. i. 11.

Haggai had come to nothing. Moreover, the seventy years of captivity predicted by Jeremiah[1] were drawing to a close; the restoration which had taken place was not regarded as the close of the captivity;[2] the Temple remained in ruins, and the bulk of the people were left in exile. In the vision the Angel of Yahweh appeals to God against the postponement of the fulfilment of His promises beyond the appointed seventy years, and is reassured by a new promise that the Temple shall be built, and Jerusalem become prosperous. A second vision[3] shows four horns, the Gentile nations, filed away by four smiths; while in a third vision[4] a surveyor, "a man with a measuring line," is forbidden to assign definite limits to Jerusalem, because the future population will be too numerous to be contained within a walled circuit.

In the fourth vision[5] Joshua the high priest is arraigned before Yahweh,[6] Satan acting as public prosecutor, so to speak. Joshua appears in filthy garments, the symbol of his sin, which is tacitly admitted. Nevertheless Satan is rebuked for undue zeal; Joshua's iniquity is taken away; sacred vestments are substituted for his filthy garments; and he is encouraged to be faithful by promises of power

[1] Jer. xxix. 10.

[2] It is not certain from what year the seventy years are to be reckoned; the nearest date in *Jeremiah* is the fourth year of Zedekiah, B.C. 593. The Captivity might be reckoned from the deportation of Jehoiachin and his companions in 597, or from the time of Jeremiah's prediction, or from the fall of Jerusalem in 587-6. In any case, the seventy years either had expired or were on the point of expiring in 519.

[3] Zech. i. 18-21. [4] Zech. ii. 1-5. [5] Zech. iii.

[6] As in the older literature, Yahweh and Angel of Yahweh are used interchangeably in this passage.

and honour. He and his fellow-priests are to bring in the Messiah, "my Servant the Branch".[1] There is also an enigmatic reference to "a stone with seven eyes," sometimes explained[2] as the foundation stone of the Temple.

It has been suggested[3] that the Jews may have ascribed their misfortunes to some sin on the part of Joshua, regarding *him* as the Achan of their times, and that this vision was intended to rehabilitate him; but it is more probable that Joshua is the representative of the people, and that the vision declares that the sin of Israel is atoned for.[4] Thus at the close Yahweh promises that He will remove the iniquity of the land in one day.[5] It is not impossible[6] that doubts may have arisen as to the legitimacy of the priesthood. The ruin of the old Temple seemed to imply the Divine condemnation of its priesthood; and probably Joshua and most of his colleagues had been born and had grown up in an "unclean" land, in exile. Both circumstances rendered it doubtful whether Joshua was acceptable to God, and the vision might very well be an answer to these doubts.

The fifth vision[7] describes a seven-branched candlestick with two olive trees, one on each side of it. On a small scale the description of these symbols is as complicated and unintelligible as Ezekiel's Cherubim. It seems natural to connect the "seven" in verse 10, explained as "the eyes of Yahweh which run to and fro through the

[1] *Çemah.*

[2] Wright, p. 73; G. A. Smith, ii., 297, regards the stone as symbolic of the finished Temple; Nowack, a jewel in the diadem of the Messianic King.

[3] Stade, p. 316. [4] Wright, p. 50. [5] Zech. iii. 9. [6] Orelli.

[7] Zech. iv. 1-6a, 10b-14; *cf.* note 4 on the next page.

whole earth," with the seven lamps in verse 2; but if so, it is difficult to understand verses 12-14, which state that the two anointed ones supply the lamps with oil. Probably verse 12 is a gloss.[1] We may then interpret the seven-branched candlestick as the symbol of the Divine Providence, ever watchful, all-knowing, all-ruling; in whose presence there stand, as representative of Israel, the two Anointed Ones, *i.e.*, the king and the high priest. *Māshiah*, or Anointed One, is a regular title of the ancient Israelite king, and the Jews looked upon Zerubbabel as king *de jure*, and hoped he might soon be king *de facto*. The exaltation of Joshua to a co-ordinate status marks an advance in sacerdotal authority; and this utterance of Zechariah's may have been intended to terminate disputes between the two leaders as to their relative position.[2] The significance of the two olive trees might be extended to embrace the civil and ecclesiastical powers generally; but the idea that they represent the Jewish and Christian Churches[3] is much too far-fetched.

The connexion in this chapter has been broken by the insertion of an independent utterance[4] intended to strengthen the hands of Zerubbabel against pessimists who discouraged the people; it promises that he shall finish the building of the Temple by the aid of the Divine Spirit, in spite of mountainous difficulties.

The sixth and seventh visions symbolise the purifying

[1] Wellhausen. [2] *Cf.* Stade, p. 315, and above, p. 75.

[3] Wright, p. 93.

[4] Zech. iv. 6b-10a, doubtless Zechariah's; making the divisions thus 6a and 10b connect as follows: "He answered and spake with me saying, These seven (*i.e.* lamps) are the eyes of Yahweh," etc. So Wellhausen.

of the land from sin; in the former[1] a huge roll is seen flying through the land; it is said to be the curse which destroys thieves and perjurers. In the latter Wickedness is shown as a woman shut up in an ephah measure, and carried away to the land of Shinar. The imagery of the eighth and last vision[2] is similar to that of the first; four chariots are despatched on Divine errands to the four quarters of the earth. The only indication of the nature of these errands is the statement that the chariot sent northwards has "quieted my spirit," *i.e.*, "satisfied my wrath," in the north country, Babylonia.[3] The chariots therefore were sent to execute God's judgments on the nations.

These symbolic visions were followed by a symbolic act; a deputation from Babylon had brought offerings of gold and silver to the Temple. Zechariah is to take of these offerings and make a crown for Zerubbabel, the Branch.[4] The promise is given that Zerubbabel shall build the Temple, and reign as king, in friendly co-operation with Joshua as high priest—another attempt to settle the differences between the two leaders.[5] The present text is confused and corrupt; *crowns* are to be made and set on the head of *Joshua*. It has also been supposed that originally crowns were made for both Joshua and Zerubbabel.

Zechariah vi. 9-15.

The last date given in connexion with the prophecies of Zechariah is the fourth day of the ninth month of the fourth year of Darius, *i.e.*, December, B.C. 518; it may cover chapters vii. and viii. In the former, the men of Bethel send to the priests and the prophets to ask whether they should continue to

Zechariah vii., viii.

[1] Zech. v. 1-4. [2] Zech. vi. 1-8. [3] Wellhausen.
[4] *Cf.* p. 81. [5] So Wellhausen.

fast in the fifth month, the anniversary of the burning of the city.[1] The prophet replied by denouncing the fasts. They were in no way acceptable to God, because those who fasted disobeyed the exhortations of the ancient prophets against injustice and oppression. Then follows a prophecy[2] describing the future blessedness of Jerusalem; it shall be the abode of truth, justice, and righteousness, inhabited by a numerous population. Old men and women shall be seen sitting in the streets, and boys and girls shall play there. Last of all,[3] we read that the fasts shall be turned into feasts; that the nations shall come to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh; and that ten men, representing all the languages of the nations, shall take hold of the skirt of a Jew, saying, "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you".

Much of the teaching of Zechariah is an elaboration of the more simple and direct words of Haggai—the sacred duty of building the Temple, its future glory in spite of its small beginning, the status of the high priest, the Messianic dignity of Zerubbabel, the working of the Divine Spirit. Zechariah's dependence on the older prophets is a symptom of the decadence of prophecy. His free use of symbolic visions recalls Amos and Ezekiel; the large part played by angels is a development of the method of Ezekiel; and the term "Branch" for the Messiah is borrowed from Jeremiah.[4] Zechariah ex-

Teaching of Zechariah.

pressly appeals to the authority of the older prophets.[5] The absence of any appeal to a legal code or to "Moses" suggests that no code had yet attained to the same authority as the ancient

[1] 2 Kings xxv. 8. [2] Zech. viii. 1-17. [3] Zech. viii. 18-23.
[4] Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15. [5] Zech. i. 4-6, vii. 7, 12.

prophets. Zechariah also shows a tendency to support his statements by arguments,[1] as if he hardly expected mere declaration to carry conviction. He shows a predilection for sets of four: four horns, four smiths, four chariots, four fasts.[2]

Haggai and Zechariah are mainly important for the practical service they rendered at a crisis in the history of revealed religion. Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah had maintained the faith and hope of Israel through the gloom of the Exile, and it was due to their successors that the zeal of the Jews was not extinguished by the distress and disappointment of the years which followed the Return.

[1] Zech. i. 4-6, 12, iv. 9.
[2] Zech. i. 18, 20, vi. 1, viii. 19.

CHAPTER VII.

OBADIAH.

THESE few verses have been the subject of much controversy. Their date and their relation to Jeremiah's oracle on Edom are alike uncertain. To take the latter question first, the earlier part of Obadiah is largely identical with a section of Jeremiah,[1] which, however, is often [2] regarded as a later addition and not the work of that prophet. There are the usual possible alternatives; the oracle in *Jeremiah* is based on *Obadiah*, or *vice versa;* or both make use of a third source. Obadiah 1-9, which describes the ruin of Edom, may be adopted from a pre-exilic oracle and adapted to later circumstances. The rest of the little book denounces Edom for their exultation over the fall of Jerusalem. The day of Yahweh is at hand on all nations, and in that day "as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee"; the house of Esau shall be blotted out. Israel and Jerusalem are spoken of as being in captivity; in the day of Yahweh they shall again occupy the whole of Palestine, including "the Mount of Esau" and the

[1] *Cf.* Obadiah 1-8 with Jeremiah xlix. 7-16, especially 1b-5 with Jeremiah xlix. 14-16, 9.

[2] Smend, pp. 238 f., etc.

territory of the Philistines. The climax of universal doom and of the restoration of the Chosen People is that "Saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the Mount of Esau," and then "the Kingdom shall belong to Yahweh".

A curious feature is the promise that "Benjamin shall possess Gilead"; apparently Reuben and Gad were forgotten.

On the face of it, the situation is that of the Exile;[1] the words of Obadiah seem to express the indignation of a man who had witnessed the eagerness of Edom to profit by the ruin of Judah.[2]

[1] G. A. Smith, etc.

[2] The whole book, however, has been regarded as (*a*) pre-exilic, *e.g.*, Volck, *P.R.E.*, dates it in the reign of Joram of Judah, or (*b*) post-exilic, *e.g.*, Wellhausen, Nowack, etc. The reference to treacherous allies in verse 7 has been understood of the occupation of Edom by the Nabatean Arabs after the Exile. Probably the book was composed in the early part of the Exile, an ancient oracle being utilised, and additions may have been made after the Exile.

CHAPTER VIII.

MALACHI.

After Haggai and Zechariah the curtain falls on the fortunes of the Jews for another seventy or eighty years. The new energy inspired by these prophets sufficed to carry the building of the Temple on to completion,[1] and it was dedicated with solemn gladness in the sixth year of Darius, B.C. 516. The inevitable reaction must have come; it was soon obvious that the completion of the Temple was not the inauguration of the glories of the Messianic era; the "nations of the earth" remained unshaken: Persia maintained its supremacy; and Judah continued to be a subject-province. In spite of more or less successful revolts, even Egypt for the most part submitted to the authority of the Achæmenidæ. The Jews had to settle down again to the dull round of sordid routine, with such relief and consolation as the more spiritually minded could derive from the Temple services and the study of the national literature.

We have seen that personal promises were made to Zerubbabel: he was to be the chosen signet of Yahweh;[2] he was to complete the Temple, and rule as a glorious

[1] Er. vi. 13-18. [2] Hag. ii. 23.

king.[1] The last clause cannot have been fulfilled, and Zechariah's prediction would have made trouble for Zerubbabel if it had come to the ears of the Persian officials. Our information is so fragmentary that we cannot draw conclusions from the silence of the Old Testament as to the fate of the "signet of Yahweh". Nevertheless, the little we do know affords some ground for the theory that he fell a victim to ambitious hopes fostered by the enthusiasm of Haggai and Zechariah. It is possible that at some moment when the break-up of the Persian empire seemed imminent, he ventured on overt acts of disloyalty to his suzerain, and speedily paid the penalty of his rashness. It is possible that the original text of *Zechariah* named a certain Belsharezer as his successor in the fourth year of Darius, B.C. 518.[2] If so, Zerubbabel did not complete the Temple. He is not mentioned in the brief paragraph on its completion and dedication.[3] Hence it has been suggested[4] that the account of the sufferings of the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah liii. is a description of the experiences of Zerubbabel. In any case the course of events must have disappointed and discredited this prince of the House of David, and discouraged the Messianic hopes of his family. The one solid gain which survived the crisis was the Temple, and the material advantage rested with the priesthood. The erasure of Zerubbabel's name from Zechariah vi. 12, and the substitution of Joshua, show that a later generation felt that they were justified in glorifying the ecclesiastic at the expence of the civil head of the community.

[1] Zech. iv. 9, vi. 13; *cf.* above, pp. 76 f., 83.
[2] Stade, p. 317. [3] Ez. vi. 13-18.
[4] Sellin, *Serubbabel.* Sellin, however, has since given up this theory.

When the memoirs of Nehemiah and Ezra and the prophecies of Malachi again throw light on the history of the Jews, we again find the community at Jerusalem a prey to religious indifference and material distress. Even the priests were careless about the ritual; they offered polluted bread upon the altar; and sacrificed blind, lame, and sick beasts which they would not have dared to present to the Persian governor; men had cheated God in discharging their vows, and had withheld tithes and offerings.[1] The priests had perverted their authority to their own ends, and had become "contemptible and base before all the people". The Divine displeasure had been shown as of old in poor crops and a scanty vintage.[2]

In B.C. 458, the seventh year of Artaxerxes I., there began a series of events which finally rescued Judaism from the slough of despond into which it had fallen, and assured the survival of the faith revealed to Israel until it was taken up and transfigured in the Gospel. A distinguished priest and student of the sacred ritual, Ezra by name, arrived in Jerusalem from Babylon, at the head of a company of about 2,000 men, besides women and children. He brought large offerings from the Babylonian Jews, and was armed with a commission from the Persian king to regulate the Temple services and the general affairs of the community. Clearly the abuses denounced by Malachi were known and resented by the Jews in the Farther East.[3]

[1] Mal. i. 7 ff., 14, iii. 7-12. [2] Mal. ii. 9, iii. 11.

[3] Ez. vii., viii. The date given in Ez. vii. 8, and implied by the arrangement of *Ezra-Nehemiah*, was rejected by Kosters (*Het Herstel*, etc., German trans.); and the mission of Ezra was placed either in Nehemiah's second term of office or even later. But this theory is for the most part rejected.

One malpractice was specially obnoxious to Ezra and Malachi and the loyal, devout Jews whom they represented. In order to understand their position, we must go back for a moment to the period immediately following the Return. It will be remembered that the Samaritans and other heathen or half-heathen neighbours had made overtures of friendship to the Jews, and had asked to be allowed to join with them in rebuilding the Temple. These overtures had been rejected. The returning exiles had felt that they could only maintain the purity of the faith by excluding all who were tainted by foreign superstition and idolatry. Moreover, they were not minded to share the glories of the Kingdom of God with all and sundry. But the literature of the period of Ezra and Nehemiah shows that this attitude had not been preserved. Malachi denounces those who divorced their Jewish wives in order to marry heathen women;[1] and Ezra, on his arrival at Jerusalem, was at once met with the complaint that "the people of Israel, the priests and Levites, had not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations," and intermarrying with them; "the hand of the princes and the rulers had been chief in this trespass". To the complainants and to Ezra the reform of this abuse of intermarrying with foreigners seemed the most urgent duty; and on it Ezra spent and exhausted his energy and authority, apparently with only slight success.[2] Even if he compelled some of the culprits to put away their foreign wives, he did not permanently improve either the material or the religious condition of Jerusalem. About thirteen

[1] Mal. ii. 10-16. [2] Ez. ix., x.

years later, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I., B.C. 445, news was brought to Nehemiah, a Jew, cupbearer to the king, to the effect that the community in Judah, "the remnant that are left of the captivity there in the province," were "in great affliction and reproach: the wall of Jerusalem also was broken down, and its gates were burned".[1] Whereupon Nehemiah in his turn obtained from Artaxerxes the governorship of Judah, with a commission to rebuild the wall, and journeyed to Jerusalem with an escort of cavalry. He succeeded in executing his task in face of the opposition of the neighbouring tribes and their confederates amongst the Jews. His next step was to improve the social conditions; owing to bad times many of the Jews had borrowed on the security of their land, and eventually found themselves deprived of their farms and vineyards, and even compelled to sell their children for slaves. Nehemiah persuaded the creditors, rich Jewish nobles, to restore the land to its original owners, or at any rate to promise to do so.[2]

Then Ezra appeared upon the scene again, and supported by the authority of Nehemiah induced the Jews to accept a certain code as the Sacred Law. The Jews and their leaders ratified this act by a solemn covenant, closely following the precedent set in the case of the Book of the Law found in the Temple in the time of Josiah. Ezra's law-book was an early edition of the Priestly Code. Ezra and Nehemiah also arranged for the proper conduct of the Temple services, and provided it with a sufficient revenue. At the same time "every one that had knowledge and

[1] Neh. i. 3. [2] Neh. ii.-v.

understanding," the devout Jews who loyally followed Ezra and Nehemiah, bound themselves by oath to observe the law, and especially to keep the Sabbath and not to marry foreigners.[1]

After spending twelve years at Jerusalem Nehemiah went back to Artaxerxes at Babylon ; and forthwith everything went to pieces. Later on Nehemiah came back, and found his bitter enemy Tobiah the Ammonite installed in a great chamber in the Temple, hand and glove with Eliashib the high priest. Due provision was not made for the services or the Levites; the Sabbath was not kept; and the Jews still persisted in marrying foreign women; even a member of the high priest's family had married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite, another enemy of Nehemiah. The reformer made short work of these abuses; he turned Tobiah out of the Temple; drove Sanballat's son-in-law into exile, and again organised the administration of the Temple, and suppressed trading on the Sabbath.

We may now return to the history of religion in the interval between Zechariah and Ezra. Our general information as to the history of Persia does not help us much. The period was that of the Persian conquest of the Greek colonies in Asia Minor, and of the futile attempts of Darius and Xerxes to conquer the Greeks in Europe; and about the time of Ezra Greek fleets and armies were supporting revolts in Egypt. No doubt echoes of these great events reached Jerusalem, and some slight interest in the Greeks may have been aroused among the more liberal-minded Jews; but Hellenic influences did not appreciably affect the community. The main results of

[1] Neh. viii.-x.

the Greek wars would be demands for tribute and recruits; and perhaps a certain slackness on the part of the Persian officials which would leave the Jews more at the mercy of their turbulent neighbours.

What can we learn by comparing the state of affairs in the time of Zechariah with that at the advent of Ezra and Nehemiah? The comparison indicates retrogression; loss of interest in religion and in public worship; a tendency to surrender the special privileges of a Chosen People, the Messianic hopes and ideals, in order to obtain more immediate and solid advantages by friendship and intermarriage with Gentile and Samaritan neighbours. On a smaller scale, the re-settlement of the Jews at Jerusalem was repeating the history of the original settlement of the Israelites in Canaan; the old danger reappeared; the people of Yahweh seemed about to be absorbed in and assimilated to their heathen neighbours; while the truths of Revelation would be hidden in a mass of heathen superstition. Nevertheless the Temple and its priesthood remained; and we also gather that the sacred caste took some interest in the sacred literature; and especially that the Deuteronomic code commanded some measure of reverence.

There is one sign of activity at Jerusalem during this period, not directly religious, but necessarily connected with the religious situation. In Zechariah's time the city had no walls, and the prophet discouraged any attempt to build walls; but Nehemiah is overwhelmed with distress because the walls are broken down, the gates burned, and the city laid waste. This violent emotion can hardly have been aroused by the sack of Jerusalem in 586, nearly a century and a half ago; nor yet by the

mere neglect of the Jews to rebuild the walls. Evidently at some time between the Return and the mission of Nehemiah the Jews had fortified Jerusalem, and later on some enemy had taken the city and destroyed the walls and gates; or the Jews may have been compelled to undo their own work at the bidding of the Persian government. This episode would naturally be associated with some new stirring of Messianic hopes, and its issue would further discourage the more ardent believers in the election and consecration of Israel.

Nevertheless, in spite of all adverse influences, there was a remnant who clung to the higher ideals of the faith. Most of the prosperous and influential classes were willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, but amongst the poorer Jews there were some who, discontented and despondent, still held to the teaching of *Deuteronomy* and the prophets.[1] Ezra and Nehemiah found a party in Jerusalem to welcome them, and Malachi speaks as the representative of this party; he is not a solitary voice.

But the future of Revelation was not bound up exclusively with the fortunes of the community at Jerusalem; the Jews in Chaldea were numerous and wealthy; they shared the prosperity and culture of a great seat of empire, and were exempt from the sordid anxieties and bitter antagonisms of their brethren in Judah. We have little express information as to the Babylonian Jews in this period; but the few references in the Old Testament show that they were able and willing to influence the Persian court in the interests of pure religion, and to make large offerings to the Temple. Zeal for Yahweh

[1] Mal. iii. 13-18.

and Israel was kept alive amongst them, so that some thousands were found willing to return with Ezra to the Holy Land. The Sacred Law was studied at Babylon, and brought to perfection in the Priestly Code. In Ezra, the scribe of the Law, we meet with a new class of Jewish ecclesiastics.

The Judaism of Babylon did not leave Jerusalem to go its own hapless, helpless way. One of the last words of Zechariah refers to pilgrims and offerings from Babylon; and Ezra and Nehemiah came from the East to revive the zeal of Judah. Doubtless, too, in the long years between, messages and pilgrims went to and fro; and the Jews of Chaldea sent sympathy and exhortation and material support to the faithful in Palestine; otherwise what was left of pure religion might have died out before Ezra came.

We will now consider more directly the Book of Malachi. It is now generally agreed that "Malachi" is not the name of an actual man. The book is really anonymous, and "Malachi," "My Messenger" or "My Angel," is a title prefixed by an editor to whom it was suggested by the "my messenger" of iii. 1. The later Jews often gave a passage a title from some striking word it contained or subject it dealt with. The book is clearly connected with the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah; we have seen above that the abuses it denounces are precisely those which the reformers strove to suppress; but it is doubtful whether Malachi prepared the way for the reforms;[1] or co-operated with the reformers;[2] or carried on their work after the final de-

Malachi.

[1] *D.B.*, Welch; Stade, p. 332 f.; G. A. Smith, ii., 345, about B.C. 460; *K.B.W.*, Kautzsch; Nowack, p. 391.

[2] *P.R.E.*, Volck; "Usually dated between the two visits of Nehemiah," Nowack, p. 391.

parture of Nehemiah.[1] On the whole, the first of these three views seems the most probable. Usually the prophet precedes the practical reformer. Malachi can hardly be the sequel to the work of Ezra; for the basis of his admonitions is Deuteronomy and not the Priestly Code; the priests for instance are spoken of as "Levi" or "sons of Levi"[2] and nothing is said about the House of Aaron, and the Law is said to have been given on Horeb,[3] as in Deuteronomy, and not on Sinai, as in the Priestly Code. It is true that some features agree better with the Priestly Code, *e.g.*, the command to bring the whole tithe into the Temple storehouse;[4] but probably some of the practices enjoined by the Code had been adopted before they received formal sanction.

There is nothing in *Malachi* to show that the work of Ezra and Nehemiah was in progress; nor is there any reference to the co-operation of a prophet or prophets in *Ezra-Nehemiah*. Our information is so meagre that this mutual silence is not a conclusive proof that the prophecy was not contemporary with the reformation; but as far as the evidence goes it is in favour of placing *Malachi* either before or after Ezra and Nehemiah.

We noticed in *Zechariah*[5] a tendency to support statements by argument; in *Malachi* this is very marked. The sections are composed according to a regular formula; a proposition is stated; those addressed are represented as objecting, "Wherein have we" done so-and-so; the prophet rejoins; the culprits reply, and so the controversy continues till the

Malachi i. 2-5.

[1] *E.B.*, Torrey, B.C. 400-350. [2] Mal. ii. 4, 8, iii. 3.
[3] Mal. iv. 4. [4] Mal. iii. 10; *cf.* Num. xviii. 21. [5] *Cf.* p. 85.

theme is exhausted. Naturally the prophet has the last word and the best of the argument.

The prophet begins by reassuring his hearers as to the love of Yahweh for Israel. Calamity and distress made the Jews doubt whether God had any special affection for them; it is significant of their wretched plight that they are expected to derive comfort from the fact that Israel is not so hopelessly and utterly ruined as Edom.

There follow two sections in which the priests are admonished for unfaithfulness in their observance of the ritual, and in their teaching. They are represented as guilty of gross carelessness and irreverence; their guilt is enhanced by spiritual callousness they defend themselves, saying, "Wherein have we despised thy name? Wherein have we polluted thee?" They regarded with contempt the ritual to which they owed their living and their status. "Behold," said they, "what a weariness it is!" Therefore Yahweh rejected their service, and held Himself more honoured by the Gentiles than by His own priests.

Malachi i. 6-ii. 9.

Again the prophet appeals to the ancient covenant of God with Levi, and to the faithfulness of the priesthood in bygone days. The priest should be the teacher in sacred truth and the guide to right conduct; but the priests of Malachi's time had used their position for selfish ends.

The prophet next turns to the people generally. He denounces the divorcing of Jewish wives to make way for marriages with foreign women, and describes the anger of Yahweh at the misery thus caused.[1]

Malachi ii. 10-iv. 6.

[1] So Stade, p. 333; G. A. Smith, ii., 363 ff.; Nowack, etc. Others, Torrey, *E.B.*, etc., understand divorce and marriage as figurative for idolatry.

He next replies to the objection that God favours the wicked rather than the good by announcing that God will come quickly to judge evil-doers. He then reproaches them with withholding the tithes and sacred dues from the Temple, and promises prosperity as the reward of liberality. Again he returns to the problem of the suffering of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked, and promises a speedy manifestation of His justice. The day cometh when the wicked shall be burned up root and branch; and for them that fear the Name of Yahweh the sun of righteousness shall rise with healing in his wings, and they shall tread down the wicked.

Finally he exhorts them to observe the Law of Moses and promises that before the Day of Yahweh, Elijah shall come to reconcile fathers to children, lest Yahweh devote the land to utter destruction.[1]

Teaching of Malachi.

Malachi, like Haggai and Zechariah, is chiefly interested in the Temple and the priesthood, not necessarily from any personal leanings to sacerdotalism, but because the sanctuary and its ministers were the focus of the religious life of his time. The sins denounced are largely ritual abuses, unsatisfactory offerings, imperfect fulfilment of vows, unpaid tithes, contempt for and weariness of public worship.[2] Yet the prophet's attitude is not that of a man to whom ritual is an end itself; he is not distressed about mere lapses in ceremonial etiquette such as the offering of the wrong sort of incense. The faults condemned imply a

[1] *Herem*, Mal. iv. 4-6, is regarded as a later addition by Stade and others; it is not *primâ facie* consistent with iii. 1, and iv. 1-3 is a much better peroration.

[2] Mal. i. 8, 12, 13, 14, iii. 8.

lack of reverence and devotion to God; and one charge at least, the perversion of the priestly function of interpreting the Divine will, is purely ethical.[1] Moreover, the Temple has become the symbol of the Divine righteousness; the guardian of truth and justice. The sanctuary is profaned by the wrongs done by the Jews to their wives, and its services cease to be efficacious.[2] Like Ezekiel and Zechariah, Malachi holds that the well-being of Israel depends on the presence of Yahweh in His Temple; and the prophet implies that the sins of people still keep Him aloof.[3] His reverence for the Temple and the priesthood makes him idealise the services and the priests of ancient days, when "the law of truth was in the mouth of Levi, and he walked with God in peace and truth," and "the offering of Judah and Jerusalem was pleasant unto Yahweh,"[4] a view of the ancient priesthood very different from that of Isaiah or Jeremiah, or the Book of Samuel.

Doubtless, too, Malachi's estimate of the importance of ritual and tithes is in marked contrast to the teaching of the older prophets. Yet he has the root of the matter in him, he is interested, as we have seen, in the moral rectitude of the priests; and he echoes the denunciations uttered by his predecessors against sorcerers, adulterers, perjurers, against those who oppress the hireling in his wages and the widow and the fatherless, and against those who deal unjustly with the "stranger".[5] His teaching as to the sanctity of marriage[6] anticipates that of Christ.

The attitude of Malachi towards the heathen is very

[1] Mal. ii. 6 f. [2] Mal. ii. 11, R.V. mg. 13; *cf.* Nowack, p. 393.
[3] Mal. iii. 1. [4] Mal. ii. 6, iii. 4.
[5] The resident alien, Mal. iii. 5. [6] Mal. ii. 10-16.

different from that of most of the prophets; his condemnation of them is exhausted in describing the judgment on Edom, settled in the pasture-lands of Judah and keeping alive the old feud by wrongs done and suffered. Otherwise the prophet's censure is reserved for the wicked amongst his own countrymen; for he no longer deals with the nation as a whole, but distinguishes between the faithful and the disloyal; the Day of Yahweh does not bring the doom of the nation, but the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous. This reward is still thought of as material prosperity.

In the same connexion Malachi discusses the problem of the sufferings of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked. His formal solution is, as we have seen, that everything will speedily be set right in the Day of Yahweh. But apart from this express teaching, the general tenor of the book further implies that the "righteous" are not perfect, and that their present distress is due to their lack of faith and obedience; they will repent, and God will deliver them.

But the most marvellous passage in the book is that which declares that the worship of the Gentiles, worship offered to many "strange" gods, is received by God as homage rendered to Himself. "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto My name, and a pure offering: for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith Yahweh Çebāôth";[1] and again, "For I am a great King, saith

[1] Mal. i. 11, R.V., so most recent scholars. Sometimes, as in R.V. mg., translated as a prediction, "My name shall be great"; but this rendering is less probable in itself and does not suit the context (*cf.* ch. iii. of Part ii.).

Yahweh Çebāôth, and My name is terrible among the Gentiles".[1]

Yet Malachi implies that Yahweh is in some special sense the Father of Israel, and claims honour and obedience on the ground of His Fatherhood.[2]

The Messianic anticipation of the establishment of a prosperous state under the restored Davidic dynasty has fallen into the background; and the hopes of the prophet for his people centre in the direct intervention of Yahweh in the Day of Yahweh.[3] But the prospect is not so immediate as in the earlier prophets; Malachi seems conscious of the bitter disappointment often caused by the too confident expectation of the speedy coming of the Messianic era. He guards against a similar mistake by stating preliminary conditions which must be fulfilled before Yahweh finally intervenes; the Angel of Yahweh shall come to purify the sons of Levi, the Priesthood. Moreover, Malachi's own ministry has not even in his own eyes[4] full prophetic value, nor can Israel now produce any prophet like those of ancient times; Elijah must return and heal the discords of the people, before the time is ripe for the great Day of Judgment and Deliverance.[5] Meanwhile God is mindful of His faithful. "A book of remembrance is written before Him, for them that feared Yahweh, and thought upon His name."[6]

Malachi alone of the prophetical books appeals to the "Law of Moses".[7]

[1] Mal. i. 14. [2] Mal. i. 6, ii. 10; *cf.* G. A. Smith, ii., 352.
[3] Mal. iii. 1, iv. 1-3. [4] But *cf.* p. 101.
[5] Mal. iv. 4-6; *cf.* Kayser-Marti, p. 202. [6] Mal. iii. 16.
[7] Mal. iv. 4. Daniel is apocalypse not prophecy.

CHAPTER IX.

ISAIAH LVI.-LXVI.

The criticism of *Isaiah* was at first occupied with showing that chapters xl.-lxvi. belonged to a different author and date from the rest of the book; attention was concentrated on the indications of exilic standpoint in xl.-lv.; and at first xl.-lxvi. were treated as a single work.[1] Soon, however, differences were observed, which were at first accounted for by supposing that some of the closing chapters were added soon after the Exile by the author of the exilic portions. Some forms of this theory are still held.[2] On the other hand, some sections of lvi.-lxvi. seemed to reflect the conditions of the close of the monarchy; they attacked social abuses and religious corruption such as were rife at that time. Hence they were supposed by some to be fragments of pre-exilic prophecies utilised by the author or editor of the latter portion of Isaiah.[3] It was suggested that some might be the work of Isaiah himself,[4] and that their presence might account for the inclusion of xl.-lxvi. in the Book of Isaiah.

[1] Bleek, ii., 47. [2] So substantially König, p. 325.

[3] Isa. lvi. 9-lvii., lix. 3-15, are often regarded as pre-exilic; *cf. B.I.*, p. 194.

[4] Bleek, p. 48.

Another section, lxiii. 7 - lxiv., states that Zion has become a wilderness, and the Temple has been burnt;[1] a situation that seems at first sight to imply the Exile;[2] but other features in this have a suggested connexion with a hypothetical sack of Jerusalem in the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus,[3] about B.C. 350, or even with the Maccabean period.[4]

Recent criticism is inclined to recognise the presence of sections added some time after the composition of xl.-lv. Some regard xl.-lxii. as substantially[5] a single work, lxiii. to lxvi. being an appendix by a different author or authors, added at a much later date.[6] But the more common opinion is that lvi.-lxvi. are a later appendix, belonging for the most part to the period 470-420, which includes the work of Ezra and Nehemiah.[7]

On the whole, these chapters imply a situation similar to that indicated in *Malachi* and the description of the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is quite possible that the editor may have included pre-exilic fragments and even material by Isaiah, or that the authors may have borrowed or imitated earlier work; it is also probable that additions were made after B.C. 420. But for our purpose it is convenient to treat the whole of lvi.-lxvi. here.

The first section[8] promises Eunuchs and Gentile pro-

[1] Isa. lxiv. 10 f. [2] Skinner.
[3] Cheyne, *P.B.* [4] Stade, p. 337 f.
[5] For the Servant passages, however, see ch. iv.
[6] Cornill, p. 161.
[7] Duhm, pp. xviii. ff.; Kayser-Marti, p. 191; Cheyne, *P.B.*; *cf.* notes p. 103; Stade, p. 337 f.; Smend, p. 339.
[8] Isa. lvi. 1-8.

selytes the privileges of the Chosen People on condition that they observe the Sabbath, a condition which recalls the measures taken by Nehemiah to enforce the observance of the day of rest. Isaiah lvi.-lix. The next section[1] denounces the rulers, "shepherds," "watchmen," and also the superstitions of "the sons of the sorceress, the seed of the adulterer and the whore," terms which an adherent of Ezra might well apply to the Samaritans. Then follows[2] a promise of peace to penitent saints, but "there is no peace to the wicked". The next chapter[3] describes the nature of the fast that is acceptable to Yahweh, and enforces the duty of observing the Sabbath.

Chapter lix. contains a confession of the sins of the people, similar to those made by Ezra,[4] Nehemiah,[5] and by the Levites in the name of the people.[6] These sins have brought the Jews into desperate straits; nothing is to be hoped for from man; but Yahweh Himself will intervene to save the penitent believers and to punish the wicked. The section concludes with a promise, a covenant, that Divine Revelation and Inspiration shall be the eternal possession of Israel: "And as for Me, this is My covenant with them, saith Yahweh: My spirit that is upon thee, and My words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith Yahweh, from henceforth and for ever".

The following chapters strike a very different note.

[1] Isa. lvi. 9-lvii. 13.
[2] Isa. lvii. 14-21.
[3] Isa. lviii.
[4] Ez. ix. 6-15.
[5] Neh. i. 5-11.
[6] Neh. ix. 6-38.

Isaiah lx.-lxii.

They celebrate the future splendour and holiness of *Zion* after the manner of xl.-lv. The resemblance is so close that they might even be by the same author, but it is more probable that they were composed under the influence of the earlier work. Returning exiles, escorted by the Gentiles, shall flock to *Zion* from all quarters. All the nations of the earth shall do homage and pay tribute to the Temple, and the recalcitrant shall be destroyed. Peace and righteousness shall abide in the city; the Jews shall be a nation of priests maintained by the labour of Gentile slaves.[1] The section includes a paragraph[2] in imitation of the Servant passages; the prophet describes his charge from Yahweh to comfort the mourners in *Zion* by proclaiming their coming deliverance and "the day of vengeance of our God". But the great idea of the Servant passages, the mission to the Gentiles, is absent. The passage is that read by Jesus in the Synagogue of Capernaum,[3] beginning:—

> The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me;
> Because Yahweh hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek.

The writer's imagination soars beyond the limits of an ideal future for the actual Israel and passes into the vague grandeur of apocalyptic. "The sun shall no more be thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but Yahweh shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory."

[1] Isa. lxi. 5, 6. According to Ezra ii., of some 40,000 Jews who returned to Judah, more than 4,000 were priests.

[2] Isa. lxi. 1-3. [3] Luke iv. 18, 19.

As the great poem of the "Second Isaiah" was inspired by the prospect of deliverance to be wrought by Cyrus, so this lesser echo may have had its occasion in the hopes raised by the appearance of Ezra or of Nehemiah, armed with the authority of Persia to serve the interests of true religion.

There follows a short section which might be regarded as an appendix to the preceding chapters. It explains how the future glory is to be brought about. God appears as a terrible conqueror, His raiment dyed with the blood of His enemies. When all human help failed, He intervened to crush the nations, and deliver His people. He comes from Edom, because the ruin of Edom is the "crowning mercy" for Israel.

Isaiah lxiii. 1-6.

Again we have an abrupt change of tone. This time we pass from exultation to despondency. The writer seeks to incline the heart of God to His people by recalling His past mercies and recounting their present miseries. Could He leave them to perish, when He had done so much for them in days gone by? Doubtless they were sinners, but their fathers too had gone astray, and yet God had not forsaken them. If the Jews had persisted in sin, was it not because God had withheld His grace? "Why shouldest Thou leave us to wander, O Yahweh, from Thy ways; why shouldest Thou harden our heart so that we fear Thee not."[1] The anger of God has driven them into sin: "Thou wast wroth and we sinned".[2] Their iniquities were many, and God was destroying them by means of their own

Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv.

[1] Isa. lxiii. 17. The translation is substantially Skinner's in *C.B.S.*

[2] Isa. lxiv. 5, R.V.

wickedness; and yet, "Thou, O Yahweh, art our Father; we are the clay, and Thou our potter; we all are the work of Thy hands". Could He destroy His own creatures? "Remember not iniquity for ever: behold, look we beseech Thee, we are all Thy people". Finally the writer appeals to the desolation of Jerusalem and the Temple: "Wilt thou refrain Thyself for these things, O Yahweh, wilt thou hold Thy peace, and afflict us very sore?"[1]

Isaiah lxv., lxvi.

The book appropriately concludes with a semi-apocalyptic picture of the Messianic times, the ultimate salvation of Israel, "the new heavens and the new earth".[2] The sinners who clung to old and new superstitions, *i.e.*, the Samaritans and their allies and their friends amongst the Jews, shall be destroyed.[3] Thus purged and purified Jerusalem shall at last fulfil her destiny and become the Holy City of God; and from that high estate she shall never again be cast down, but shall abide an Eternal City of Righteousness. "As the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before Me, saith Yahweh, so shall your seed and your name remain."[4] The Divine favour will be shown by material prosperity; a fertile land, freedom from sorrow, length of days, peace, and the return

[1] Isa. lxiv. 8-12. On the date of this section see above, p. 104. If we are to place this with the neighbouring sections in the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, we might not unreasonably suppose that the Temple had suffered in the catastrophe in which the walls of the city were broken through and the gates burnt. If so, the section would be dated shortly before the first visit of Nehemiah. Or possibly an exilic document may have been partially adapted to later circumstances. For lxiii. 16, see below.

[2] Isa. lxv. 17-22.

[3] Isa. lxv. 1-7, 11-15, lxvi. 3 f., 16 f., 24.

[4] Isa. lxvi. 22.

of exiles from all the nations escorted by the Gentiles.[1] The practical interest in the Temple services is shown by the provision that Jews thus returning may serve as priests and Levites.[2]

On the other hand, there are ideal features that transcend actual experience; the writer follows an earlier prophet, perhaps Isaiah,[3] in declaring that, in the new dispensation, "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and dust shall be the serpent's food. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain, saith Yahweh."

The last verse but one tells how on new moon and Sabbath "all flesh" shall come to worship at the Temple, "before Me," possibly a prediction of the ultimate universality of true religion. It may be, however, that in speaking of "all flesh" the writer is only thinking of the Chosen People, now purified from sinners.

Then the Book of Isaiah concludes with a grim picture. As the worshippers leave the Temple they look upon the carcases of God's enemies consumed by the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched.[4]

Obviously these chapters are not the consecutive portions of a single work; nor are they homogeneous in style and spirit. Even apart from editorial additions, they can hardly be the work of a single author. Yet substantially they seem to represent the religious thought of loyal Jews of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the period following that of Malachi.

Teaching of Isaiah lvi.-lxvi.

[1] Isa. lxv. 8, 13, 18-23, lxvi. 12, 20.

[2] Isa. lxvi. 21. It is possible, consistently with the context, to understand this to mean that Gentiles shall be taken for priests and Levites; but the view given in the text is more probable.

[3] Isa. xi. 6-9. [4] On lxvi. 1, 2, see below.

They are largely secondary, repeating and imitating the pre-exilic prophets, and Isaiah xl.-lv.,[1] and Zechariah.[2] In spite of interest in the Temple and the Sabbath, these chapters most emphatically enforce the ethical teaching of the older prophets.

The writers are much occupied with the great practical problem of the period, the maintenance of a society of faithful Jews, a true Israel, untainted by association with the Samaritans and those who sympathised with them. The problem is approached in a liberal and discriminating spirit. Although no quarter is shown to the champions of corrupt life and worship, there is to be room in the purified community for believing Gentiles, proselytes, and even for eunuchs.

As in *Malachi*, sin and punishment, repentance and forgiveness are no longer dealt with simply as concerning the nation. The Jews fall into two classes, the wicked, hopelessly hardened and impenitent, for whom there is nothing but condemnation; and the righteous, who are indeed sinful, and yet confess their sin, and repent and obtain forgiveness. For the righteous, speaking in their name, the prophet pleads with much boldness, urging the incomparable power, and holiness, and love of God as an irresistible claim for mercy.[3] There is even the suggestion that forgiveness is due to the children of God —for in spite of sin they are His children—because they could not have fallen so low, if God had not made them what they are, and left them to their own devices.[4]

Nevertheless in spite of thus dealing with the Jews in two classes, the real interest is still in the community.

[1] *Cf.* p. 36. [2] *Cf.* Isa. lviii. and Zech. vii.
[3] Isa. lxiv. [4] Isa. lxiii. 17, lxiv. 7, 8.

The time will come when the wicked will be destroyed, and Israel, purified, will again be a holy people.[1]

In the pictures of the future we have most of the usual features of the Messianic Age ; but the Messianic King has disappeared ; there is no prospect of deliverance by natural means or human agents ; the hope of Israel lies in the direct, personal intervention of Yahweh. He will give peace, prosperity and glory to His people ; He will destroy their enemies, especially Edom, and make the Gentiles their servants and tributaries.

By this time Jerusalem stands for Israel, and the Temple is of supreme importance, so that the Chosen People are to be a nation of priests.[2]

The idea of Israel's mission to the world is not wholly lost, but this also centres in the Temple, it is to be a "house of prayer for all nations".[3]

We have reserved two difficult passages for separate treatment. In the first,[4] the penitent Israelites seeking mercy from God declare "Thou art our Father, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us : Thou, O Yahweh, art our Father ; our Redeemer[5] from everlasting is Thy name". It is not easy to understand how the faithful remnant, who thought of themselves as the true Israel, could conceive that they might be unknown to Abraham and unacknowledged by Israel. The natural interpretation would be that the pre-exilic situation had reappeared ; the officials in Church and State had fallen back on unworthy views of religion, and those who were loyal to the teaching of Deuteronomy and the prophets were treated as heretics and bad

[1] lxii. 12. [2] Isa. lxi. 6. [3] Isa. lvi. 7, lxvi. 23.
[4] Isa. lxiii. 16. [5] *Go'el.*

citizens. Some such situation may have arisen in the period before the first or before the second visit of Nehemiah, when the Jewish nobles and the High Priest were hand and glove with the Samaritans. This, however, is not the view generally taken of the verse. It is often passed over without any adequate discussion. Sometimes it is explained to mean that Yahweh is the true Father of Israel, not the patriarchs; they are powerless in the hour of need,[1] a view which seems a mere truism, unless with Cheyne[2] we suppose that "there were some Jews who regarded these patriarchs as semi-divine beings, capable of helping those who applied to them"—a kind of ancestor worship.

The second passage[3] seems inconsistent with the general attitude of these chapters towards the Temple; it seems to deny the need of any temple: "Thus saith Yahweh, Heaven is My throne, and earth is My footstool: what manner of house will ye build unto Me? and what place shall be My rest? For mine hand hath made all these things, and so they all came to be, saith Yahweh." The only obvious explanation is that the paragraph[4] did not originally belong to its present context, but was an isolated fragment representing the views of a party who contended for a spiritual worship without sacred places. The passage has been explained as addressed to the unrighteous party among the Jews, its intention being to exclude them from participation in building the Temple;[5] a view which might be varied by supposing the words addressed to the Samaritans. Either explanation, how-

[1] So substantially Delitzsch, Skinner.
[2] *P.B.*, so also Marti and Duhm.
[3] Isa. lxvi. 1, 2.
[4] Isa. lxvi. 1-4.
[5] Delitzsch.

ever, places the passage too early, just before or soon after the Return. Cheyne at one time[1] regarded these verses as merely a declaration of the principle that, though the Temple was legitimate and desirable, yet God "dwelleth not in temples made with hands"; but more recently[2] he has adopted Duhm's view that the verses are directed against the Samaritans. It is difficult to understand how any one could use this principle against a Samaritan temple in view of the obvious possibility of turning it against the sanctuary at Jerusalem—until one reflects on the illogical onesidedness of ecclesiastical controversies.

[1] *Prophecies of Israel*, 1889.

[2] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 383, and *P.B.*; so also Stade, p. 337, Marti, and Skinner (doubtfully).

CHAPTER X.

THE GREEK PERIOD.

Joel, Zechariah ix.-xiv., Jonah, Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii.[1]

After Ezra and Nehemiah we know little of the history of the Jews till the time of the Maccabees. While the Persian empire continued the general political situation remained unaltered. In B.C. 350, under Antiochus III. Ochus, a number of Jews were transported to Hyrcania ;[2] possibly on account of some rising at Jerusalem. It has been supposed that this was the occasion of the sack of the city and temple referred to in Isaiah lxiii. f.[3] Probably during this period the Samaritans built their temple on Mount Gerizim.

But even from the time of Cyrus, the influence of the Greeks was felt more and more both in Egypt and in Western Asia. The younger Cyrus in his revolt against Artaxerxes II. Mnemon, B.C. 401, mainly relied on Greek mercenaries. After his death at Cunaxa, Xenophon conducted the survivors to the Greek cities on the Euxine through the heart of the empire in the celebrated Retreat of the Ten Thousand. At last Alexander the Great made

[1] See the end of the chapter for shorter passages which may belong to this or the preceding period.

[2] Wade, p. 487. [3] *Cf.* pp. 104, 107 f.

himself master of Asia and Egypt in a few rapid campaigns, B.C. 334-324; but his dominion fell to pieces at his death, and after some years of confusion Egypt and Syria became independent Greek States under dynasties founded by Ptolemy and Seleucus, two of Alexander's generals.

For nearly two centuries Palestine was a bone of contention between these two kingdoms, and Judah especially belonged sometimes to Egypt and sometimes to Syria. Jerusalem suffered at the hands of both parties, but on the whole the Ptolemies were much more sympathetic than the Syrian kings. At the beginning of the second century Judah passed into the possession of Syria, and Antiochus IV. Epiphanes attempted to Hellenise the Jews. In B.C. 168 the Temple was plundered and polluted, and the Syrian king tried to suppress Judaism by persecution. The Jews rose in insurrection under the priestly family of the Maccabees, and after desperate struggles succeeded in asserting their independence, the Maccabees becoming sovereigns with the double title of high priest and king.[1] In the first century B.C. the Maccabees were supplanted by the Idumæan dynasty of the Herods, and soon Palestine fell under the dominion of Rome, first as a subject-kingdom and then as a part of a province.

We may gather something as to the inner history of the Jews and their religion in the interval between Nehemiah and the Maccabees. The work of Ezra and Nehe-

[1] At first only high priest, Jonathan, B.C. 153; the additional title of king was assumed by Aristobulus I., B.C. 105, but Simon was recognised as hereditary head of the state, both ecclesiastical and civil, in B.C. 141.

miah had permanent results; the existence and authority of the Pentateuch in later times shows that the priestly code, the law which Ezra brought from Babylon, held its own, but was obliged to share its supremacy with Deuteronomy and the older records of the law and history of Israel. A compromise was effected by blending them all into a single work, the *Torah*, which became an authoritative written statement of the will of God for Israel; in other words, a Bible. At the beginning of the Christian era we find the most earnest and pious Jews, the Pharisees, mainly occupied with interpreting and enforcing the detailed ceremonial regulations of the *Torah*. In the interval there must have been a fairly continuous development of the legalistic tendency of Judaism; during the struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes the marks of the true Jew were circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, and the refusal to eat unclean food. Probably at most times the ceremonial law and the Temple services were the dominant interests. Psalms were written and collected, mainly that they might be sung at the Temple; and the history of Judah was rewritten in *Chronicles*, chiefly as a history of the Temple from the standpoint of the *Torah*.

But religious thought was also active outside of the *Torah;* the prophets were edited and completed. Some time in this period our books of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah were completed, and the collection of the Twelve was made.[1] Moreover, the Hebrew Wisdom flourished in the centuries after the Exile. The problem of the apparent lack of any moral government of the

[1] *Cf.* p. 121.

world was discussed in *Job* and *Ecclesiastes*, and somewhat differently in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, while the principles of conduct were expounded in *Proverbs* [1] and the *Wisdom of Ben Sira*.[2] Also a final revision was made of the older historical books.

This literary activity indicates a wide range of religious interests, and suggests opposing views, independent schools of thought, and a measure of controversy. Over against the dominant party with their emphasis on ritual, the Temple and the exclusive privileges of Judaism, there were others who followed the prophets in dwelling upon the claims of the moral and spiritual life, and kept alive the Universalist ideas of the Second Isaiah and his successors. Sometimes the difference would be merely a difference of emphasis amongst men who fully accepted each other as orthodox; sometimes the supporters of broader and more spiritual views found themselves regarded with dislike and suspicion, without being absolutely excluded from the fellowship of Israel.

The conquests of Alexander had not been merely political; in the train of his armies, Greek thought, Greek customs, Greek language, Greek commerce, had swept over the East, and most of the important towns of Egypt and Syria were thoroughly Hellenised so that the Jews were now accessible to such influences as they had never been before. Up to the time of Alexander Judaism had two great centres, Babylon and Jerusalem; but Alexander founded Alexandria, and a large Jewish quarter arose in the new city. Henceforth Alexandria became

[1] There may be exilic or pre-exilic material in *Proverbs; cf. B.I.*

[2] Ecclesiasticus.

a third centre of Jewish life. During this period too the Jews became dispersed far and wide, and came into contact with Hellenic culture, philosophy, and religion at many points. The broader, cosmopolitan movement of Jewish thought which is illustrated by the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the writings of Philo and of Josephus, must have begun soon after B.C. 330, if not before. Even Jerusalem did not altogether escape.

While, no doubt, there were those who tried to combine the best features of Hellenism and Judaism, the more militant enthusiasts for Greek fashions and ideas were ready to sacrifice the essential faith of Israel for æsthetic and intellectual attractions and material advantages.

It is curious and instructive that the priesthood of the Jerusalem Temple were seldom thoroughly loyal to the true faith. Often they regarded the religious enthusiasm of the people chiefly as a source of wealth and power and dignity, and were ready to ally themselves with the opponents of Judaism in order to secure or augment their privileges. Even Jeremiah was opposed and persecuted by the priests; the High Priest Eliashib was treacherously confederate with the Samaritans against Nehemiah; and in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes the head of the Greek party was a certain Jesus,[1] brother of the high priest, and afterwards high priest himself. The Maccabean priest-kings used their priesthood chiefly to support their secular power, and in our Lord's time the priests were chiefly Sadducees.

Thus in our period currents of legalism, of more spiritual Judaism, of Greek philosophy, and of mere

[1] *Jason* in the Greek documents.

worldly Hellenism mingled in the stream of Jewish life. We have now to consider the relation of our few prophetical documents to these various forces.

The contents of *Joel* indicate the period after the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. This short book has numerous parallels with a wide range of literature from Amos to Malachi, and the relation is apparently one of dependence. There is no reference to a king, and the community is spoken of as "priests and people".[1] It is implied that under ordinary circumstances the Temple ritual is carefully observed, for a prominent feature of the calamity from which the Jews are suffering is that "the meal offering and the drink offering are withholden" from the Temple.[2] The prophet promises the return of the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem.[3] The statement that Jews have been sold as slaves to the Greeks suggests a date either after[4] or not very long before[5] B.C. 333. As usual in the post-exilic literature doom is pronounced against Edom; but here Egypt[6] is coupled with Edom, a combination which would be easily understood if the book were written after the establishment of the Greek kingdom of Egypt,

The Book of Joel.

[1] Joel i. 13 f., ii. 16 f. [2] Joel i. 13. [3] Joel iii. 1.

[4] Kayser-Marti, p. 191, "after fifth century".

[5] Driver, *Joel and Amos*, *C.B.S.*, p. 25, *c.* B.C. 500, or maybe a century after Malachi. The phenomena of the book have sometimes been interpreted as indicating an early pre-exilic date. *Joel* is supposed to have been largely used by later writers; and the prominence of the priests and the silence as to a king has been explained by ascribing the book to the minority of Joash, when the high priest was regent; so Volck, *P.R.E.*, Dillmann, B.C. 836-797. The integrity of the book is sometimes contested.

[6] Joel iii. 19.

shortly after harsh treatment of the Jews by one of the Ptolemies.

The book describes a great plague of locusts,[1] which is regarded as a symbol and prelude of the Day of the Lord.

Joel, Contents. The people are exhorted to fast and to hold a solemn assembly at the Temple; deliverance is promised to a remnant of the Jews; and punishment is to overtake their enemies.

Here too apocalypse takes the place of the Messianic anticipations of earlier prophets. The Day of the Lord

Joel, Teaching. is accompanied with portents in the heavens, the darkening of sun, moon and stars; and all the nations of the earth are gathered for doom to the Valley of the Judgment of Yahweh[2] near Jerusalem. There is no mention of the Davidic king. The attitude of the prophet towards the Gentiles is simply one of condemnation. Yahweh shall be known as dwelling in Zion, and then Jerusalem shall be holy, and no foreigners shall be admitted within its walls.[3] A remarkable feature of Joel's picture of the ideal future is the promise[4] that the spirit of Yahweh shall be poured out upon all flesh;[5] that children shall prophesy, old men dream inspired dreams, and young men see divine visions, and the spirit will even be bestowed upon the slaves, even the slave-girls; a passage which recalls Jeremiah's new covenant under which all shall know Yahweh.[6]

[1] The locusts are sometimes regarded as figurative of an invading army; but this view is less probable.

[2] Valley of Jehoshaphat, *i.e.* "Yahweh judgeth," iii. 12.

[3] Joel iii. 17. [4] Joel ii. 28, 29.

[5] The general context, however, implies that the prophet is thinking only of Jews.

[6] Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.; *cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f.

It is now generally agreed that the later chapters of *Zechariah* were not written by the author of, and do not belong to the period of, the earlier portion. The form of the two sections is different; in i.-viii. there are notes of date and authorship— on a certain day of a certain month of a certain year of Darius the word of Yahweh came to Zechariah; the prophet speaks throughout in the first person; and there is an elaborate machinery of angels and visions. These characteristics are entirely absent from ix.-xiv.[1] Moreover, the two sections imply different historical standpoints; the earlier chapters clearly belong to the period after the Return,[2] the rest of the book was written later.[3]

Zechariah ix.-xiv., Date, etc.

A further question arises as to the unity of ix.-xiv.; this section is naturally divided into (*a*) ix.-xi. with xiii. 7-9, and (*b*) xii. 1 - xiii. 6, xiv. These two parts are ascribed sometimes to the same author, sometimes to two different authors.[3] The evidence is not conclusive, and the question is not material to our present purpose.

The following features, amongst others, indicate the Greek period as the time of origin of these chapters. The Greeks are spoken of as the chief enemies of Israel.[4] Exiles are to be brought back from Egypt and Assyria and settled in Gilead and Lebanon; the pride of Assyria shall be humbled, and the sceptre shall depart from Egypt. In a document which speaks of the Greeks, Egypt and Assyria will be the Greek kingdoms of Egypt and Syria.[5] In xii. we have a "burden of Yahweh con-

[1] The first person is sometimes used in the later chapters, but in symbolic fashion.

[2] *Cf.* pp. 78 f. [3] *Cf.* below. [4] Zech. ix. 13.

[5] Syria is a contraction of Assyria; *cf.* Ezra vi. 22, Judith i. 1, and *B.I.*, p. 260 f.

cerning *Israel*," which is wholly concerned with Judah and Jerusalem, giving us the post-exilic identification of Judah with Israel. The contemptuous attitude of xiii. 1-6 towards prophets suggests a very late period when it was recognised that prophecy was dead or dying. In xiv. the apocalyptic element, the interest in ritual holiness, and the attitude towards the Gentiles all point to the same conclusion.[1]

Zechariah ix.-xi., xiii. 7-9.

The first part begins with a description of an invasion in which the neighbours of the Jews—Hadrach, Damascus, Hamath, the Phœnicians and Philistines—suffer severely, while the Temple is protected from harm.[2] Then we read of the coming of a victorious king to Zion, who shall give peace to Jerusalem and to the whole earth, and exercise a world-wide dominion;[3] and next of the victory of Judah and Ephraim over the Greeks through the aid of Yahweh Çebāôth;[4] the return of exiles, and the humbling of Egypt and Assyria. Next follows an obscure allegory[5] concerning the sufferings of the Jews at the hands of their "shep-

[1] *Cf.* below. Parts or even the whole of this section have sometimes been dated before the Exile; Zech. xi. 13 is quoted in Matt. xxvii. 9 as from Jeremiah, and accordingly attempts have been made to show that these chapters are the work of Jeremiah. Other grounds, too, have been found for a pre-exilic date, notably the mention of Ephraim, Assyria, Damascus and Hamath. It is possible that ix.-xi., xiii. 7-9, may use pre-exilic material. *Cf. B.I.*, pp. 259 ff. Dillmann holds that ix.-xi., etc., is based on a prophecy of B.C. 734 (p. 499), and that xii. ff. was written B.C. 586-566 (p. 516). The late post-exilic date is more generally held, *e.g.*, Kayser-Marti, p. 191, second century B.C.

[2] Zech. ix. 1-8.

[3] Zech. ix. 9, 10.

[4] Zech. ix. 11-x. 12.

[5] Zech. xi., xiii. 7-9.

herds" or rulers, three of whom are to be cut off in one month. Yahweh Himself grows weary of the task of shepherding the people, and gives them over to the tender mercies of a "worthless shepherd," whom in the end He punishes. At last, however, there appears a "faithful shepherd," the "fellow" of Yahweh Çebāôth; but He is slain and the people are scattered; a promise, however, is given that a third part shall be saved and purified, and shall be God's people. This allegory no doubt reflects the circumstances of the writer's time. Probably the tyranny of the priestly rulers, the official representatives of Yahweh, made men despair of all help, human or divine; and the hopes raised by the appearance of a pious and patriotic priest were quenched by his violent death.

The second part begins with a striking description[1] of a siege of Jerusalem. We have the familar apocalyptic idea that the Gentiles will be gathered together against Jerusalem to their own destruction; but there is also the strange feature that *Judah* is at first the ally of the enemy, but afterwards becomes reconciled to Jerusalem and shares its deliverance—probably a reflection of the circumstances of the times. After the deliverance Judah and Jerusalem shall be purified and glorified; the people shall mourn "him whom they have pierced," possibly the "faithful shepherd" of xiii. 7; and the land shall be cleansed from sin and uncleanness, from idols and prophets and unclean spirits.

Zechariah xii. 1 - xiii. 6, xiv.

In the last chapter[2] we have yet another siege of

[1] Zech. xii. 1 - xiii. 6.

[2] Zech. xiv. Verses 13, 14 are out of place here; they may have been transferred from xii.

Jerusalem by the Gentiles. This time they actually take the city and sack it. Then Yahweh appears, destroys the Gentiles, delivers the Jews and establishes His eternal kingdom in Jerusalem. The remnant of the Gentiles shall regularly come up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, any who fail in this observance shall be punished by lack of rain. As Egypt is independent of rain, the Egyptians shall be punished by a plague,[1] if they do not make this yearly pilgrimage. Finally everything in Jerusalem shall be "holy," *i.e.*, ceremonially clean and fit for use in the worship of Yahweh, down to the bells on the horses, and the ordinary cooking utensils.

Zechariah ix.-xiv., Teaching.

These chapters present as we have seen many of the ordinary features of post-exilic teaching, apocalypse, the doom of the Gentiles, ritual sanctity, etc.; with special points already mentioned which seem due to the political circumstances of the times. We may also emphasise the following. The special points just referred to would be an interesting addition to our knowledge of the history of the Jews after the Return if they were less obscure, and if we could assign them with certainty to a definite period. Perhaps, as it is, something may be made of them.

Unless the references to Ephraim[2] are purely symbolic and archaic, we may suppose that in the Greek period Galilee had been partly occupied by the Jews, and was regarded as representing the ancient Ephraim; discord, however, seems to have arisen between Judah and this restored Ephraim.[3] Even in the south, there was not

[1] See R.V. mg. [2] Zech. ix. 10, 13, x. 7. [3] Zech. xi. 14.

complete harmony;[1] the community had enlarged its territory beyond the mere district about Jerusalem, and the outlying towns and villages resented their dependence on the city.

The house of David again appears, and in some passages occupies a unique, almost Messianic, eminence; "the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem"[2] takes the place of Joel's "priests and people," and in the day of deliverance "the weakling shall be as David, and the house of David as God, as the Angel of Yahweh before them".[3] But, apparently in the same context, the family of David is only one of four leading houses, the other three being Nathan, Levi and Shimei.[4] This emergence of the house of David coincides with the reappearance of the Messianic king,[5] who, however, is now a Prince of Peace. But, elsewhere, deliverance is simply by the direct intervention of Yahweh.[6]

Prophecy has altogether fallen from its high estate, and has become a profession for charlatans who only venture to practise their imposture in secret.[7]

The familiar prediction of the doom of the Gentiles is modified by the provision that a remnant shall be left to worship Yahweh at Jerusalem. When the Philistines are destroyed "a remnant shall be for our God";[8] and

[1] Zech. xi. 2-6, xiv. 13 f. [2] Zech. xii. 7, 10, xiii. 1.

[3] Zech. xii. 8.

[4] Zech. xii. 1 - xiii. 6 may not be altogether homogeneous. Nathan is possibly David's son (2 Sam. v. 14, Luke iii. 31). Shimei may be a Levitical family (Exod. vi. 17).

[5] Zech. ix. 9, 10.

[6] Zech. ix. 14, 15, another sign of the heterogeneous character of ix. - xi., etc., xii. 4, 7, xiv. 3 ff.

[7] Zech. xiii. 2-6. [8] Zech. ix. 7.

ultimately, as we have seen, all the surviving Gentiles are to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.[1]

Jonah, Date, etc.

Jonah ben Amittai encouraged Jeroboam II., B.C. 783-743, to recover the lost territory of Israel "from the entering in of Hamath to the sea of the Arabah, according to the word of Yahweh, the God of Israel"; he was a prophet of Gath-hepher in Zebulun.[2] The book makes no express statement as to its date or authorship, and there is nothing to show that it was written by Jonah or by one of his contemporaries. On the other hand, the internal evidence points to a post-exilic date. Jonah's Prayer[3] is a mosaic of quotations from the Psalter, including some post-exilic psalms, and elsewhere. Nineveh is spoken of vaguely as if it had long since ceased to exist, and we read of a "King of Nineveh," instead of the usual "King of Assyria". The style and language also suggest the last period of Biblical Hebrew.

Jonah, Teaching.

The book is regarded by most scholars as an allegory, or symbolic narrative. It may be a formal allegory in which Jonah is Israel, charged by God with a mission to the world, shrinking from its task, and only fulfilling it when disciplined by calamity.[4] Or we may regard the incidents of the story as typical of God's purpose of salvation for the heathen, of the resentment which this purpose inspired in many

[1] Unfortunately two of the most famous verses in these chapters, xi. 13, xiii. 7, are obscure and corrupt.

[2] 2 Kings xiv. 25.

[3] Jonah ii. 2-10, sometimes, however, supposed to be a later addition.

[4] So G. A. Smith, *Minor Prophets.*

zealous Jews, and of the Divine persistence. Circumstances after the Return had accentuated the antagonism of Jews and Gentiles; and fanaticism had exaggerated the policy of Ezra and Nehemiah; *Jonah* is a protest of the more Liberal Judaism in the spiritual succession of the Servant of Yahweh.

Another feature is important for the interpretation of Old Testament predictions. Jonah, by Divine command,[1] declares that Nineveh shall be destroyed in forty days; and yet Nineveh is spared because the people repented.[2]

Another document of this period is Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. A post-exilic date for these chapters is suggested by their position in the book, as an appendix to the collection of oracles on the nations, a collection which itself contains post-exilic insertions, *e.g.*, the section on Babylon, xxi. 1-10.[3] There is a studied vagueness in the pictures drawn for us here that makes it difficult to assign them to any exact date. The main theme is the doom of a certain City of Confusion.[4] If this means Babylon the period of composition might be the close of the Exile or later. This city, however, has also been identified with Jerusalem itself, or with the post-exilic Samaria, sacked by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129. This last identification would involve a date in the second century.[5] The combination of a judgment upon the

Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii.

[1] This is evidently the intention of the context.

[2] *Jonah* is dated as follows: Kayser-Marti, p. 191, after fifth century; Kőnig, *D.B.*, before 500 B.C.; post-exilic, Cheyne, *E.B.*

[3] Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. are dated as follows: post-exilic, Stade, p. 226; Dillmann, p. 405; second century B.C., Kayser-Marti, p. 191. The Isaianic authorship has been defended in a monograph by W. E. Barnes, Camb., 1891.

[4] Isa. xxiv. 10. [5] *Cf.* above.

earth with cosmic convulsions[1] belongs to a somewhat advanced stage of apocalyptic and connects this document with the other works treated in this chapter; and the promise that exiles shall return from Assyria and Egypt[2] might well belong to the period of the Greek kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. The section is probably a compilation from various sources; or a composition on the basis of older material. The author is largely influenced by Isaiah, and it is, of course, possible that genuine Isaianic fragments have been incorporated.[3]

This apocalypse, as it may well be styled, recurs again and again to the widespread ruin connected with the overthrow of the City of Confusion and the doom of the enemies of the true Israel. These catastrophes issue in the deliverance of the faithful people of God; the exiles shall all return, "Yahweh shall beat off his fruit, from the flood of the River (Euphrates) unto the brook of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel".[4] The figure suggests that the bulk of the exiles have already returned, and that now the scattered individuals still left behind shall be gathered in. They shall return to worship Yahweh in His holy mountain at Jerusalem,[5] the sufferings of Israel have been a fatherly chastisement of sins, which are now forgiven.[6]

A certain variety of style and ideas may be explained by composite authorship. The dramatic vigour of some passages is very striking; note especially the way in

[1] Isa. xxiv. 1, 23.
[2] Isa. xxvii. 12 f.
[3] *Cf. B.I.*, p. 181 ff.
[4] Isa. xxvii. 12.
[5] Isa. xxvii. 13.
[6] Isa. xxvii. 7-9.

which the pictures of judgment alternate with songs of grateful thanksgiving.[1] Elsewhere we have didactic maxims after the manner of *Proverbs*;[2] and sometimes the obscure allusiveness of apocalyptic becomes unintelligible.[3]

The features of the Day of Judgment seem to extend beyond the natural world; Yahweh will punish not only "the kings of the earth upon the earth," but also "the host of the high ones on high," perhaps a reference to the gods of the nations or to angels; "they shall be shut up in prison, and after many days they shall be visited or punished".[4] Apparently the dead of past generations shall be restored to life to share the deliverance of Israel;[5] and in the new age men no longer die, "He hath swallowed up death for ever,"[6] and all nations share the blessings of the Chosen People, "He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering that is cast over all peoples, and the veil that is spread over all nations . . . the Lord Yahweh will wipe away tears from off all faces". In true post-exilic fashion we find, side by side with these generous anticipations, exultation over the ruin of a petty neighbouring tribe which was not too insignificant to be hated, "Moab shall be trodden down".[7] Usually Edom is exalted to this unhappy eminence; it is difficult to understand why Moab is singled out in this one instance, unless the name is symbolic of one of the great heathen powers, as Edom, later on, stood for Rome.

Recent criticism assigns many other passages, phrases,

[1] Isa. xxiv. 16, xxv. 1 f., xxvi. 1 f., etc. [2] Isa. xxvi. 7-10.
[3] Isa. xxvi. 19b, etc.
[4] Isa. xxiv. 21 f., obscure; *cf. A.B.D.*, pp. 429, 530.
[5] Isa. xxvi. 19. [6] Isa. xxv. 8. [7] Isa. xxv. 10.

single verses or paragraphs to the period after the Exile. It is impossible to consider these in detail; especially in view of the great diversity of opinion as to what is pre-exilic, exilic, or post-exilic; but reference will be made to some of them in the general discussion of the doctrine of the exilic and post-exilic prophets. The presence, however, of late editorial notes in most or all of the prophetical books can hardly be doubted. This editorial work testifies to the constant study of the sacred literature, and to the continuity of the religious tradition.[1]

Other late Fragments.

[1] In addition to passages already specified, the following have sometimes been assigned to the periods during and after the Exile: Isa. iv. 2-6, xix. 16-25; Jer. x. 1-16, xvii. 19-27, xxx.-xxxiii. (mostly), xlvi.-xlix. (wholly or partly); Hos. xiv.; Amos ix. 8-15; Mic. iv. 1-5 (= Isa. iv. 2-6), parts of Mic. vii. 7-20; together with numerous short passages, some of which are referred to in the discussion of separate doctrines.

PART II.

EXPOSITION OF THE VARIOUS DOCTRINES OF THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHETS.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

THE later literature for the most part uses the names of God current in ancient Israel. *Yahweh* is the ordinary Divine Name. *Elohim*, "God," occurs frequently in such phrases as "my God," "our God," and otherwise as a common noun, meaning a deity, *e.g.*, "Thus saith Yahweh that created the heavens, he is God".[1] The absolute use of *Elohim*, virtually as a name of the one true God, is chiefly confined to Malachi.[2] *El* is also used as a common noun, both for the true God[3] and for heathen gods,[4] chiefly in the Second Isaiah. The use of El and Yahweh in this period is also shown by the proper names, *e.g.*, Ezekiel, Joel, Zechariah.[5] The contracted form *Yah* is only found in the combination *Yah Yahweh*.[6]

Divine Names and Titles.

The compound name *Yahweh Çebāôth*, which Dillmann describes as the Divine Name characteristic of the prophets or of the period of the Monarchy, persists in all the

[1] Isa. xlv. 18.

[2] Mal. i. 9, etc.; elsewhere Isa. xlvi. 9 (?), Ezek. i. 1.

[3] Isa. xlvi. 9. [4] Mal. ii. 11; Isa. xliv. 10, etc.

[5] *Cf.* Buchanan Gray.

[6] Isa. xxvi. 4. Unless indeed the "Yah" is merely an accidental repetition of the first two consonants of *Yahweh*.

prophetical writings [1] of our period, except Ezekiel, Joel, and Jonah. It is frequent in *Haggai* and *Zechariah*.

We have also the combination *hā-El Yahweh*, the God Yahweh.[2]

In *Isaiah* we meet with *'Adōn*,[3] "Master" or "Ruler" as a Divine Name, sometimes as *'Adōnāy*,[4] "My Master," sometimes in the phrase *hā 'Adōn Yahweh Çebāôth*.[5] These titles, however, do not recur in the later literature, but we find in *Obadiah*, in the Servant passages, in Third Isaiah, Zechariah, and especially in *Ezekiel* the title *'Adōnāy Yahweh*, "my Master Yahweh," [6] a phrase also found in *Jeremiah* and *Isaiah*.[7]

The following ancient names also occur: *'Elyōn*, "Most High"; [8] *Çur*, Rock; [9] *Shaddai*, E.V. "Almighty".[10]

[1] *E.g.*, Isa. xiii. 4, xxi. 10, xxv. 6, xlv. 13, xlvii. 4; Jer. l. 25; Hag. i. 2; Zech. i. 3, xii. 5, xiv. 21; Mal. i. 10.

[2] Isa. xlii. 5. [3] אֲדֹן.

[4] אֲדֹנָי, E.V. "Lord". The pointing makes the word a variant of the plural with first pers. suffix, אֲדֹנַי, *'ădōnāy*, "my masters"; *ā* being substituted for *ă* to indicate the reference to God. The plural is a plural of majesty as in the case of *Elohim*. The consonants might be pointed as a singular, אֲדֹנִי, "my master"; or אֲדֹנַי might be regarded as an archaic plural, "masters"; but these views are not probable.

[5] Isa. x. 33.

[6] Isa. l. 4, lvi. 8; Ezek. ii. 4; Obad. i. 1, etc.; E.V. "Lord *God*".

[7] Jer. i. 6; Isa. xxviii. 16; Mal. i. 6 speaks of God as *'Adōnîm*, "Master".

[8] עֶלְיוֹן, Isa. xiv. 14.

[9] צוּר, Isa. xliv. 8, and in xxvi. 4 as צ׳ עוֹלָמִים, "rock of ages," "everlasting rock".

[10] Ezek. i. 24, x. 5; Joel i. 15. The etymology and meaning of this

Elohim and Yahweh and Adon also occur in compound titles, describing the relation of God to the world, "Master *'Adon*," or "God of the whole earth";[1] or His relation to Israel, "God of Israel," "Yahweh your God," "our God,"[2] etc.; the Lord that dwelleth in *Zion*;[3] or His attributes "God of Truth,"[4] "God of Justice".[5]

The later chapters of *Isaiah* also reproduce the characteristic Isaianic titles, "Holy One of Israel,"[6] "Mighty One of Jacob".[7] *Melech*, "King," is comparatively rare as a Divine title, probably because it was a common title of heathen deities and practically the name of the god of Ammon, but Second Isaiah follows Isaiah in using it of the God of Israel, speaking of Him as "the King of Jacob,"[8] "your King,"[9] "the King of Israel";[10] so also in Malachi i. 14 Yahweh is "a great King". The late artificial singular *'ĕlōah* is found in Isaiah xliv. 8 for "God".

Second Isaiah multiples epithets of God, accumulating several in a single series; thus, "Elohim Yahweh, He that created the heavens, and stretched them forth; He that spread abroad the earth and that which cometh out of it; He that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and

Name are uncertain; it is also explained as the "Destroyer" or the "Raingiver".

[1] Zech. iv. 14, vi. 5; *cf.* Mic. iv. 13 and the title "God of Heaven," אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם, in Neh. i. 4, etc.; Ez. v. 11, etc.; Isa. liv. 5.

[2] *Passim* in all the prophetical literature of the period.

[3] Joel iii. 17-21. [4] Isa. lxv. 12. [5] מִשְׁפָּט, Mal. ii. 17.

[6] קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, Isa. xli. 14, xlix. 7, lx. 9; *cf.* i. 4.

[7] אֲבִיר יַעֲקֹב, Isa. xlix. 26, lx. 16; *cf.* i. 24.

[8] Isa. xli. 21. [9] Isa. xliii. 15; *cf.* vi. 1. [10] Isa. xliv. 6.

spirit to them that walk therein";[1] "I am Yahweh thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour";[2] "I am Yahweh, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King";[3] and again, "Thus saith Yahweh the King of Israel, and his redeemer *Yahweh Çebāôth:* I am the first and I am the last; and beside me there is no God".[4] To the titles contained in these verses we may also add from the Second Isaiah "everlasting God,"[5] "thy Former,"[6] "thy Maker"[7] and "thy Husband".

In the closing chapters we find "O Yahweh, Thou art our Father, we are the clay, and Thou our Potter; we all are the work of Thy hand".[8] Malachi also speaks of God as "Father".[9]

We may add a word or two as to the titles that are characteristic of this period. "Creator," from the root *bārā'*,[10] first appears in this period. It is not certain how *bārā'*, "create," differs from *'āsâ*, "make," or *yāçar*, "form as a potter forms vessels". *Bārā'* is clearly a strong word, used rarely, and carrying a very special emphasis; it seems to be used of acts in which an exceptional, direct, Divine intervention is manifest, especially

[1] Isa. xlii. 5. [2] Isa. xliii. 3. [3] Isa. xliii. 15.

[4] Isa. xliv. 6. [5] אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם, Isa. xl. 28.

[6] יֹצְרֵךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, Isa. xliii. 1, or perhaps "thy Potter"; *cf.* below, note 8.

[7] Isa. liv. 5, עֹשַׂיִךְ and בֹּעֲלַיִךְ, both plural; possibly "thy Builder" should be read for the latter.

[8] Isa. lxiv. 8. "Our Father" also Isa. lxiii. 16. A comparison of lxiv. 8 with xliii. 1 suggests "Potter" for "Former" in that passage.

[9] Mal. i. 6. [10] בָּרָא; *cf.* below, p. 164.

of new departures such as the beginnings of important things, the world, life, man, Israel, etc. But Stade is probably right in holding that *bārā'* describes a fashioning out of existing materials, and does not necessarily involve a creation from nothing.[1] God, therefore, as the Creator of heaven and earth and of Israel, made them to be heaven, earth, Israel respectively.

"Saviour," *moshia'*,[2] is the giver of safety or victory, the deliverer of Israel from its enemies. It is partly defined by the context, thus, "I Yahweh . . . thy Saviour gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee". Cyrus or his successor receives many conquests as his reward for overthrowing the oppressors of Israel.

"Redeemer," *gō'ēl*, is strictly the next-of-kin, united to his kinsman by the closest ties of affection, privilege and duty. If a man were murdered, it was the duty of his *goel* to avenge him; if he died without children, the *goel* was called upon to marry his widow that the issue of this union might continue the dead man's family, and that his name might not be blotted out, and the sacred rites of the family might be maintained. The duties of a *goel* to a living kinsman are not clearly defined, but he would naturally do his best to succour him in distress, to assist him against his enemies, and to ransom him from captivity. Hardly any tie was more binding, or inspired more confidence, than that between the *goel* and his kinsman; and the prophets declare that this bond unites Yahweh and Israel.

For the original meaning of the ancient names and titles of God, the reader is referred to the volumes in this

[1] P. 349. [2] מוֹשִׁיעַ.

series on the literature of the earlier periods. In cases where the etymology of a name was not obvious, the name would be used in a conventional sense without any consciousness of its derivation, history, or original meaning. Where the current form suggested an etymology, real or apparent, there would be a tendency to interpret the name or title in the light of what was or seemed to be its derivation. Thus for practical purposes Yahweh was simply the personal name of the God of Israel, Elohim a common noun for an exalted supernatural being, assimilating to our "God" as the faith of the Jews became more consciously and explicitly monotheistic. Probably *Shaddai* was as pure an archaism to the post-exilic Jews as it is to the ordinary Englishman. Terms like "Most High" (*'Elyon*), "King," "Rock," "Master" (*'Adōn*), "Saviour," "Redeemer" (*Go'el*), "Husband," carried an obvious meaning. "Creator" (*Bōrē'*) no doubt was readily understood, but it was probably to some extent a technical term whose full meaning had to be learnt from the documents in which it was used.

Whatever the derivation of Yahweh may have been, the form of the name suggested a connexion with *hāwāh* or *hāyāh*, "to be," and may always have suggested to Israelites the idea of unchangeableness,[1] or one or other of the many other ideas cognate to "being".[2]

A name, however, means far more than can be obtained from its form or etymology; it calls up all that the hearer or speaker knows of the person who bears it; for the Israelite the Name of God stood for the character, work,

[1] So Dillmann, p. 218. [2] *Cf.* Exod. iii. 13-15.

and person of God, as far as these had been manifested. So that when the prophets wished to say that God would act consistently with His Revelation, they said that He would save Israel "for His Name's sake".[1] The desire of the faithful is to "His Name".[2] "Hebrew," as Dillmann wrote,[3] "has no word for essential being,"[4] but the Name stands for the essential being of God, as far as it is known. Hence the Name could be used for God Himself; even in Isaiah[5] the Name comes from far, and in post-biblical Hebrew *hash-Shem*,[6] the Name, was used for God. By the popular identification of the symbol with that which it symbolises, the mere name, written or pronounced, was supposed to have magic virtues.[7]

It will be seen that the prophetic literature which we are studying affords no clear evidence of a tendency to regard Yahweh as too sacred for common use, and to substitute for it Adōnāy or Elohim. Indeed, except in Malachi iii. and Jonah our writers do not use Yahweh and Elohim promiscuously; they confine themselves almost exclusively to Yahweh, either by itself or in combination with Çebāôth or Adonay.[8]

[1] Isa. xlviii. 9; Ezek. xxxvi. 22, etc.
[2] Isa. xxvi. 8.
[3] P. 209; *cf.* also pp. 208 ff.
[4] *Wesen.*
[5] Isa. xxx. 27.
[6] הַשֵּׁם.

[7] The direct evidence for this is from a later period; but it was probably always a part of the popular faith.

[8] It is, however, possible that the combination Adonay Yahweh may not always be original, but may be the first step towards the later method of indicating that Adonay was to be read for Yahweh. In the first instance Adonay may have been set beside Yahweh to show that though Yahweh was the true text Adonay was to be read. Later on this method was supplanted by that of writing the vowels of Adonay with Yahweh. The earlier method may have only been ap-

No living religion can altogether avoid speaking of God in terms borrowed from man's experience of himself.

Anthropomorphism.

The attempt to avoid anthropomorphism leads at last to a barren philosophy, in which God becomes a mere negation, the τὸ μὴ ὄν of Philo! At an early stage of the development of religion this attempt is not even made; in the primitive narratives of *Genesis* Yahweh is frankly spoken of as if He were a man; and even when Isaiah has a vision of God, he sees a King. Indeed, anthropomorphism marks a certain advance in religion; it means that man discerns a personality behind or immanent in the universe, endowed with some or all of those qualities which he himself possesses. He may not have philosophical ideas such as personality; but the world makes on him something the same impression his neighbour makes upon him, perhaps even something the same impression that he makes upon himself.

The anthropomorphic form of thought persisted in our period, Ezekiel's vision of God is also in the form of a man.[1] God is spoken of as possessing bodily organs and faculties; He has eyes[2] and sees;[3] He has a mouth,[4] breath,[5] a voice[6] and speaks;[7] He has ears[8] and hears;[9] He has nostrils[10] and smells; He has arms and hands, and makes His people, and forms them as a potter[11] forms his vessels; He has a face and loins.[12] In Zechariah iv.

plied partially in some books, and only partially corrected later on. Hence the presence of Adonay Yahweh and Yahweh in the same passages.

[1] Ezek. i. 26. [2] Isa. lxv. 12. [3] Isa. lvii. 18.
[4] Isa. xlv. 23. [5] Job iv. 9. [6] Ezek. i. 24.
[7] Isa. xxiv. 3. [8] Isa. lix. 1. [9] Isa. xlix. 8.
[10] Isa. lxv. 5. [11] Isa. li. 9; Ezek. i. 3; Isa. xlv. 11, liv. 5, lxiv. 8.
[12] Isa. liv. 8; Ezek. i. 27.

10 we have "the seven eyes of Yahweh which run to and fro through the whole earth".

Such language is not in itself a proof of an actual belief that God has a body and organs like a man; it may be figurative. Most, if not all, of the passages referred to might be paralleled from the New Testament and from modern religious literature. But the free use of anthropomorphic terms without any attempt to guard against the doctrinal implications shows that practically God is thought of as a man without any consciousness that this habit of mind is erroneous and needs to be corrected. Possibly there may have been popular teachers in the period of the monarchy who would have expressiy taught anthropomorphism as a doctrine; but it is not likely that Amos or Isaiah would have formally and deliberately endorsed such teaching. The modern Christian is able for the most part to ignore these difficulties because the Incarnation provides him with a human object of worship in Christ, Who is at once Divine and Human, without necessitating anthropomorphic language about the Godhead itself.

The use of images was a lower grade of anthropomorphism, or of inferior ways of realising God. God is not only thought of as like man, but He is supposed to be worthily depicted by a figure of given shape and colour, and is popularly identified with the figure. Hence the first step in the correction of anthropormorphism is the attack upon images. They have eyes and cannot see, ears and cannot hear, hands and cannot handle, and are therefore inferior to Yahweh, Who can see and hear, and can fashion Nature and Man.[1]

[1] Isa. xlv. 12.

But we know from the extra-prophetical literature of this period that the more thoughtful Jews were conscious that anthropomorphic language was unsatisfactory. The Priestly Code, especially in its account of the Creation,[1] avoids such terminology as far as possible, and thus furnishes a marked contrast to the parallel narrative.[2] Ezekiel is also conscious of the problem. He was far too practical to refuse to say that God saw and spoke, or to deny that the Divine vision appeared to him in human form. But he guards against the idea that God is merely a glorified man, and strains the resources of language in order to make it clear that what he has seen is neither an exact image of God, or anything exactly human. It was "the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh,"[3] "a likeness like the appearance of a man,"[4] and it had "the appearance of loins". Conversely, in Genesis i. 26 God proposes to make man in His image,[5] after His likeness.[6] Similarly both Ezekiel and Zechariah often avoid the necessity of human-like speaking and acting on the part of God, by interposing angels between Him and His prophets.[7] The exalted terms which the Second Isaiah uses show that though he could not avoid anthropomorphic language, he was far from holding any crude anthropomorphic doctrine. "To whom then will ye liken God," he cries,[8] "or what likeness can ye set over against him."

[1] Gen. i. 1 - ii. 4a. [2] Gen. ii. 4b-25; J.

[3] מַרְאֵה דְמוּת כְּבוֹד יהוה Ezek. i. 28.

[4] דמות כְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם, Ezek. i. 26.

[5] צֶלֶם. [6] דְּמוּת. [7] See below, p. 168.

[8] Isa. xl. 18.

A feature of anthropomorphism is the idea that God at any given time is limited to one spot. Indeed primitive religion almost required that a deity should always reside in one sanctuary either fixed or movable. The worshipper must know where to find his deity, and if that deity can only be in one place at a time, he must be at some definite spot, either in a fixed sanctuary or in some shrine whose movements are known. Hence of old Yahweh dwelt on Sinai, or went forth with the Ark. But this view, rigorously pressed, inevitably leads to polytheism, each community must have a deity in their own district. Hence the god of a nation occupying a large territory is thought of as having his special home, where he is usually to be found, but as also making expeditions elsewhere. Yahweh, for instance, comes from Sinai or Edom or Mount Paran to help Israel in Canaan.[1] A further step is that there come to be many places where God manifests Himself. Thus in the time of the monarchy, Bethel and other places where Yahweh had appeared to the patriarchs were sanctuaries. But this development led back to polytheism, to the popular mind the Baal or Yahweh of Bethel came to be thought of as a different deity from the Baal or Yahweh of Beersheba. Towards the end of the monarchy the Israelites went back to the doctrine that Yahweh dwelt in a single sanctuary, the Temple at Jerusalem; and this doctrine is maintained during our period.[2] Yahweh, however, is capable of leaving the

[1] Jud. v. 4; Hab. iii. 3; Ps. xviii. 6. The Sinai of the Old Testament was probably in the south of Edom; *cf.* Isa. lxiii. 1.

[2] Isa. xxiv. 23, lvi. 7, lxvi. 6; Ezek. viii. 4, xliii. 2-9, xliv. 2-4; Jer. l. 28; Joel iii. 21; Jonah ii. 4; Hag. ii. 7-9; Zech. viii. 3, xiv. 16-21; Mal. iii. 1.

Temple ; though it is normally His special dwelling, He is independent of it, and can exist without it. The sanctity of the Temple consecrates Jerusalem, which becomes a Holy City, in which God is specially interested.[1] On account of the sins of the people the Glory of Yahweh leaves the Temple before the fall of Jerusalem,[2] but returns to it when the people are restored and forgiven.[3] Similarly in the dark days before Ezra and Nehemiah, Yahweh is absent from the Temple, but He will return to purify His sanctuary and make it worthy of Himself.[4] It is noteworthy that Ezekiel sees the Glory of Yahweh in Chaldea before he sees it leave the Temple ;[5] Yahweh could manifest Himself to His faithful servants everywhere.

Here again the idea of God "dwelling" in the Temple arises out of the necessity of associating a person with a definite place ; the prophets of this period did not interpret it as limiting Yahweh. The Second Isaiah, in spite of its keen interest in the Temple, avoids the use of any terms which would expressly localise Yahweh. The later chapters of *Isaiah* definitely protest against any such localisation, and approach to an express statement of the doctrine of Divine Omnipresence. Yahweh is "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity," who dwells "in the high and lofty place, with him also that is of a humble and contrite spirit" ;[6] and again, "the heaven is My throne, and the earth is My footstool : what manner

[1] Isa. lii., lx. 14 ; Ezek. xlviii. 15 ; Zech. viii. 3. Zion is used for Jerusalem as the Holy City.

[2] Ezek. x. 18 f., xi. 22 f. [3] Ezek. xliii. 2-4.

[4] Mal. iii. 1-4. [5] Ezek. i. [6] Isa. lvii. 15.

of house will ye build unto Me? and what place shall be My rest? For all these things hath My hand made."[1]

The localisation of Yahweh was also a consequence of the organic union which existed according to primitive ideas between a people, its land, its god. Yahweh, therefore, was the God of the land of Israel. His power was specially manifested in Canaan; there only could the ritual of His worship be fully observed, and there only could men fully enjoy the blessings of His grace. When Cain leaves the homeland, the prototype of the land of Israel, he is "hidden from the face of Yahweh".[2] David's exile from the inheritance of Yahweh seems necessarily to involve his serving other gods.[3] On the other hand, when colonists from the East settle in the land of Israel, they are plagued with lions until they learn to worship with due rites the God of the land, Yahweh.[4] Naaman, desiring to worship Yahweh outside of His own land, gets over the difficulty by providing himself with two mules' burden of earth, and Elisha sanctions the arrangement.[5]

In our period Canaan still remains specially the land of Yahweh. The sacrificial worship of Yahweh ceases when the people leave Canaan, and is only resumed when they return.[6] The exiles are said to eat unclean food in a foreign land.[7] The cities of Israel are the holy cities of Yahweh;[8] its mountains are "My mountains".[9] Judah is the Portion of Yahweh.[10] At the same time the

[1] Isa. lxvi. 1. [2] Gen. iv. 14. [3] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.
[4] 2 Kings xvii. 24 f. [5] 2 Kings v. 17-19.
[6] *Cf.* pp. 18 ff. [7] Ezek. iv. 13.
[8] Isa. lxiv. 10, "thy holy cities". [9] Isa. lxv. 9.
[10] Zech. ii. 12 (Heb. 16).

course of history,[1] as interpreted by the prophets, minimised the significance of this idea. The exiles in Babylon, before and after the Return, enjoyed fellowship with God; prophets were raised up among them; the Glory of Yahweh appeared by the Chebar; Yahweh is "a sanctuary" for the exiles "in the countries where they are come".[2] The later prophets emphasise the connexion of Yahweh with the Temple rather than with the land. God freely exercises His dominion over the nations; He is "the Lord of the whole earth".[3] Clearly His connexion with Canaan is no longer a limitation.

The anthropomorphism of the Old Testament is in marked contrast to that of heathen religions in that it never speaks of God as feminine. The comparison of God's love to that of a mother,[4] and of the manifestation of His emotion to the groans of a woman in travail,[5] are no real exceptions.

Anthropopathism.

Anthropopathism, the habit of thought and language by which "human emotions and modes of conduct are thrown back upon God," is even more unavoidable than anthropomorphism, and is freely used in the Old Testament, as in all religious literature. According to Davidson,[6] "All the phenomena of the human soul of which as men we are conscious, and all the human conduct corresponding to these emotions, are thrown back upon God". It is a little doubtful whether he is justified in this statement, even though he is writing of the Old Testament as a whole; it is certainly not true of the literature with which we are dealing.

[1] Stade, p. 275. [2] Ezek. xi. 16. [3] Zech. iv. 14, etc.
[4] Isa. xlix. 15, lxvi. 13. [5] Isa. xlii. 14. [6] P. 113.

Nevertheless it holds good for many of the phenomena of the soul. God is spoken of as possessing intellectual faculties, knowledge,[1] thought,[2] wisdom,[3] memory;[4] volitional faculties and qualities, will, hope, desire, repugnance,[5] fear, purpose, change of purpose, "repentance," choice;[6] emotions and moral qualities, love and hate, grief, jealousy,[7] anger, compassion, joy, righteousness, zeal, indignation,[8] loving-kindness,[9] sympathy and pity, holiness.

The relations of God to man, and especially to Israel, are described in terms of human relationships;[10] He is Father, King, Master, Deliverer, Husband, Bridegroom,[11] Next-of-Kin (*Goel* or "Redeemer"), Friend,[12] Judge.[13]

He has also the organs of the intellect, will and emotions, heart,[14] mind, bowels (seat of the emotions),[15] reins,[16] spirit.[17]

His conduct is just: "I Yahweh love judgment, I hate robbery for a burnt-offering; and I will give them their recompense in truth".[18]

We may now consider the teaching concerning God

[1] Isa. xlviii. 3 f. [2] Isa. lv. 8. [3] Isa. xl. 14.
[4] Isa. xliii. 26. [5] Isa. lxv. 3; Mal. ii. 17.
[6] Joel ii. 13 f.; Jonah iv. 2; Isa. xiv. 1.
[7] Mal. i. 3; Isa. xlviii. 14; Zech. viii. 17; Isa. lxiii. 10; Joel ii. 18.
[8] Isa. xiii. 13, xiv. 1, lxv. 19, li. 5, lix. 17, lxvi. 14, זַעַם.
[9] חֶסֶד, Isa. liv. 8; *cf.* below, p. 151; Isa. lxiii. 9.
[10] *Cf.* above, pp. 136 ff. [11] Isa. lxi. 10.
[12] Isa. xli. 8, אֹהֵב. [13] Ezek. vii. 3.
[14] Ezek. xxviii. 6. [15] Isa. lxiii. 15.
[16] Kidneys, seat of emotion and moral feeling.
[17] רוּחַ, *rûaḥ*, Isa. xlviii. 16. [18] Isa. lxi. 8.

that is implied by these anthropopathic descriptions of Him. As anthropomorphic language implies that God is a Person, anthropopathism implies that He is an intelligent, moral Person.[1] The prophets thought of Yahweh as possessing certain qualities with which they were familiar in men. We shall speak further of the Divine Power and Wisdom later on, and confine ourselves for the present to His moral nature and His benevolence.

God a Moral Person.

Our literature often dwells on the self-consistency of God, and sets forth this attribute in many ways. It is sometimes spoken of as the *righteousness*[2] of God, sometimes as His truth.[3]

"Righteousness" and "truth" are often coupled as parallels and almost synonyms, thus "the judgments of Yahweh are true and righteous"; and "He shall judge

[1] *Cf. A.B.D.*, p. 113.

[2] צֶדֶק, צְדָקָה, *çedeq*, *çĕdāqâ*. The original meaning of the root is doubtful. A common use of these and cognate words is forensic; the *çaddîq* or "righteous" man is the man whose conduct is approved of by a judge or court of justice, the man whose conduct is consistent with what public opinion and law expect from him in view of his previous sayings, doings and undertakings. When these terms are applied to God, the analogy with human life partly fails; there is no superior authority which can approve of God's acts. His righteousness is the agreement of His present and future dealings with what men have been led to expect by His Revelation of Himself.

[3] אֱמֶת, *'ĕmeth*, from the root אמן, which, in its various forms, means to be sure, certain, firm, trustworthy, faithful; to make sure, etc.; to regard as sure, etc., *i.e.*, to believe. *'Emeth* therefore is not so much the correspondence of a statement with facts, truth of the intellect, as the correspondence of conduct with the expectation aroused by promise, professed character, previous behaviour, etc.

the world with righteousness and the people with His truth ".[1] " Righteousness " again in the later chapters of Isaiah is similarly coupled with " deliverance ":[2] " I bring near My righteousness, it shall not be far off, and My deliverance shall not tarry ".[3] Yahweh manifests His righteousness to the Jews by delivering them from their troubles, in accordance with His promises and His relation to them. In danger God protects His people " by the right hand of His righteousness,"[4] their safety lies in His loyalty to them. Even Yahweh Himself is said to lean upon His righteousness;[5] just as we might say that a man's consistent life gave him strength or firmness of character. Again God speaks righteousness, His utterances are consistent with Himself and with one another, thus, " I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return ".[6] When Yahweh dwells in Jerusalem it is called a " city of truth ".[7] He assures Israel of His favour by a covenant which shall not be annulled.[8] God's purposes to bless or punish are alike unalterable:[9] " I, Yahweh, change not ".[10] Hence having once chosen Israel, He remains faithful to His people in spite of their sins, " for His Name's sake," " for His own sake,"[11] and does not forsake them.[12] We are told in the most emphatic way

[1] Ps. xix. 9, xcvi. 13; *cf.* lxxxix. 14, cxix. 142.

[2] תְּשׁוּעָה, *tĕshû'â*, E.V. " salvation ".

[3] Isa. xlvi. 13; *cf.* li. 5, 8, lvi. 1, lix. 16 f.

[4] Isa. xli. 10. [5] Isa. lix. 16. [6] Isa. xlv. 19, 23.

[7] Zech. viii. 3. [8] Isa. liv. 10; Ezek. xxxiv. 25, xxxvii. 26.

[9] Zech. viii. 14, 15. [10] Mal. iii. 6.

[11] Ezek. xx. 9, 14, 22, 44; Isa. xliii. 25. [12] Isa. xli. 17.

that the counsels of God have been "perfectly faithful" from old.[1]

Self-consistency, "righteousness," "truth," clearly involves two great virtues of conduct and speech, keeping of promises, and truth of statement;[2] but further the question arises as to the nature of the "Self" with which God is consistent. Formally there is no authority to which God submits His conduct and character; yet men apply to God the terms by which they express their approval of each other; and thus declare their approval, so to speak, of God. The prophets do not make God the standard for men, passing a favourable judgment on human acts when they correspond to Divine; but by their language they imply their belief that in certain respects the character and conduct of God correspond to qualities and acts which men approve in each other.

Thus while the Second Isaiah and Ezekiel often use righteousness of God's faithfulness, it is also applied to all that would characterise a "righteous" man; and God and His acts are spoken of as upright[3] and perfect.[4] On the other hand, the existence of evil or unworthy qualities in God is denied. Ezekiel represents the people as denying that the way of God "is equal," or fair;[5] the prophet

[1] אֱמוּנָה אֹמֶן, *'ĕmûnâ' omen*, the combination of two cognate synonyms forms an emphatic compound; *cf.* "kith or kin," Isa. xxv. 1.

[2] Isa. xlv. 19, 23; on some statements apparently inconsistent with the above, see below.

[3] יָשָׁר, Isa. xlv. 19, xxvi. 7. [4] תָּמִים.

[5] יִתָּכֵן, *yittākhēn*, Ezek. xviii. 25, 29.

indignantly repels this accusation. "Yahweh is upright, and there is no unrighteousness in Him."[1]

The ethical nature of God is further shown by the fact that He rewards righteousness and punishes wickedness; He is angry with the wicked. His judgment as to what is righteous and wicked coincides with what we should call "the enlightened conscience of the best men".[2]

Benevolence.

One feature of the ethical idea of God needs special consideration, His benevolence. He seeks the happiness and welfare of His people. The prophets delight to accumulate terms which express this attribute. The classical passage is that which Joel and *Jonah* quote from one of the oldest documents of Hebrew literature: "Yahweh your God . . . is gracious and full of compassion, slow to anger, and plenteous in loving-kindness,[3] and repenteth Him of His purpose to afflict His people".[4] The Divine benevolence is perhaps most fully expressed by the Hebrew חֶסֶד, *ḥeṣedh*, for which we have no English equivalent. Of the E.V. renderings, "mercy" is unsatisfactory and misleading, and "loving-kindness" is inadequate. Professor G. A. Smith has suggested "leal love," of which we understand the English "loyal love" does not give the full meaning.[5] *Hesedh* involves the idea of loyalty, but specially that affectionate and beneficent loyalty which should exist between kinsfolk. Thus *hesedh* is frequently coupled

[1] Ps. xcii. 15, עוֹלְתָה.

[2] *Cf.* below.

[3] חֶסֶד, *ḥesedh*.

[4] Joel ii. 13, the conclusion is paraphrased; *cf.* Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7; Jon. iv. 2.

[5] *Exp. B.*

with "truth".[1] So that when Yahweh speaks of Himself as the Husband and Kinsman[2] of Israel, He declares that He will show "everlasting loving-kindness" to His people.[3] In the same spirit God is spoken of as the Father[4] of His people; and we have the promise that "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you".[5] *Hesedh*, as we have implied, includes loving affection; in "loving-kindness" God comforts His people, shows them tender love.[6] *Hesedh* further denotes active beneficence, and is often coupled with *ṭôbh*,[7] "good," as for instance in the familiar refrain, "For he is good and his loving-kindness endureth for ever".[8] *Tôbh* in such contexts is "good" in the sense in which Barnabas was a "good"[9] man, and denotes "beneficent".

While *hesedh* does not specially denote what we properly mean by "mercy," *viz.*, the exemption of a culprit from penalty; yet the Divine loving-kindness is manifested in God's dealings with sinners. He is patient, and slow to anger; He does not desire the death of a sinner, but that he may turn from his wickedness and live: "I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord Yahweh".[10] The Divine benevolence is further emphasised by statements that Yahweh shows "favour,"[11]

[1] Ps. cxvii. 2. [2] *Goel*, "Redeemer".
[3] Isa. liv. 5-8. [4] P. 136. [5] Isa. lxvi. 13.
[6] רַחֲמִים, *raḥămîm*, Isa. liv. 7, 8. [7] טוֹב.
[8] Ps. cxxxvi. 1, etc.
[9] Acts xi. 24, where "good" renders *ἀγαθός*; *tôbh*, however, is rather equivalent to *χρηστός*; *cf.* Dillmann. *Tôbh* is applied to God in *Isaiah*.
[10] Ezek. xviii. [11] חֵן, *ḥēn*.

and is "gracious,"[1] inclined to show Himself friendly and bountiful; and by references to His love and pity for His people.[2] Self-sacrifice and similar human virtues can hardly be ascribed to God; although He is often so closely identified with Israel, that He might almost be said to suffer with His people.[3] But those whom God most fully inspires and approves, *e.g.*, the Servant of Yahweh and the Shepherd who is His fellow,[4] suffer willingly for men; and the Divine approval of self-sacrifice implies some corresponding quality in the Nature of God.

No doubt the prophets of our period duly set forth the just severity of God; but they dwell much more on His benevolence, so that they give the impression that—to use anthropopathic language—His severity is an unfortunate necessity which He accepts with reluctance, but that His essential nature is benevolent.

There are some qualifying considerations which might have been referred to in speaking of the ethical character and the benevolence of God. These were omitted in order that they might be treated together. The ascription to God of wrath, fury, and violent emotion is hardly in accordance with some modern ideas of the Divine Nature; it may be said to partake of Patripassianism. Such expressions, however, are not scientific propositions as to the ultimate

Limitations.

[1] Joel ii. 13, חַנּוּן, *ḥannûn*.

[2] אַהֲבָה, *'āhābhâ*; חֶמְלָה, *ḥemlâ*, Isa. lxiii. 9.

[3] Isa. lxiii. 9. "In all their affliction He was afflicted"; the sense is doubtful.

[4] Zech. xiii. 7.

nature of the Godhead; but are a popular, pictorial means of describing the moral earnestness of the Deity. The term *qin'â*,[1] "zeal," fervent, enthusiastic feeling for the right cause, belongs to the same class; the E.V. "jealousy" gives an unworthy impression. At the same time the Divine zeal is often referred to in passages where God is spoken of as jealous, in the usual English sense, for His own honour: "My glory will I not give to another, nor My praise to graven images". Moreover, we read of the "enemies"[2] of God in passages which seem to imply that the enmity is not wholly one-sided. But a careful consideration of the context will show that the prophets do not think of God as a Potentate who is sensitive of His dignity because He is greedy of deference and adulation. The cause of God was that of man; if God's glory were given to another and His praise to graven images, the throne of heaven would no longer be filled by a moral, benevolent being.

A more important consideration is that God's benevolence is for the most part directed towards Israel.[3] This may be partly explained by remembering that the prophets naturally realise God's goodness most in the experiences of their own people, and speak of it accordingly. We may sing of the "God of our Fathers" or of "England of the Lord beloved," and omit to include in our hymn-books anything about God's love for France or Germany; but we have no intention of propounding a theological doctrine of the limitation of God's benevolence. The nature of God was best known to the prophets in His dealings with Israel, and therefore their

[1] קִנְאָה. [2] Isa. xlii. 8, 13. [3] *Cf.* below.

doctrine of His relation to Israel is the best account of His moral character. So far, at any rate, this partiality for Israel does not mean that the God of the prophets was limited in His essential benevolence; but that their comprehension of the range of His activities was limited.

But further, the cause of God often seems unduly identified with the political interests of Israel, almost as if it were a moral principle that the devout Jews must prosper at any cost to the Gentiles. Yahweh may be the God of the whole earth, but only for the benefit of the Jews. Here again, however, such teaching is rather a symptom of a lack of sympathy and breadth on the part of some of the later prophets than of any failure to think of God as moral or benevolent. Moreover, this partial view is not universal in the literature we are considering; we have to set against it the more liberal views of the Servant passages, of Jonah, and of Malachi.

However, this subject concerns, as we have suggested, not so much the Divine Nature, as the relation of God to Israel and the Gentiles, and we shall return to it under that head. The prophets held that God was benevolent in Himself, and that His benevolence was operative wherever possible. Why it could not have free scope for Edom, for example, is another question, to be discussed later.

One or two more details may be noticed here. God is sometimes spoken of as "repenting," changing His mind, abandoning His purposes;[1] but always that He may forgive. Nevertheless, the language contradicts other statements[2] as to the unchangeableness of God's pur-

[1] Joel ii. 13. [2] P. 149.

poses. The contradiction is in the language not in the ideas. The prophets did not compose scientific statements of theology but addresses for the edification of the people, and popular language becomes contradictory when it describes different aspects of truth. From a modern point of view we might say that God does not change, but that a change in man, *e.g.*, his penitence, alters his relation to God, and makes God's attitude to him different. Before He seemed to have a purpose to afflict the man, now He has given up that purpose. His real unchangeable purpose was to deal righteously and graciously. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that Ezekiel and Joel were conscious that there was no real contradiction; though they might not have explained matters in quite the same way.

There are also a few passages in which God seems to be spoken of as the intentional author of moral evil;[1] thus, "If the prophet be deceived and speaketh a word, I, Yahweh, have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out My hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of My people Israel".[2] And again, as a punishment for the sins of Israel: "I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments wherein they should not live".[3] The latter verse, indeed, probably means disadvantageous statutes and judgments, which brought disaster, but there

[1] Isa. xlv. 7, "I make peace and create evil," may be set on one side, and rendered "I make prosperity and create calamity or misfortune". Evil, *ra'*, here is not moral but material evil, pain, sorrow, suffering. It is contrasted not with virtue, but with prosperity.

[2] Ezek. xiv. 9, "deceived," R.V. mg. "enticed," is a form of the root *pāthâ*.

[3] Ezek. xx. 25.

is little difference in principle. We have here a survival of that frank recognition of the Divine Sovereignty which is found in the older documents, in which God hardens Pharaoh's heart;[1] sends an evil spirit upon Saul;[2] is thought capable of stirring up Saul against David for no obvious reason;[3] moves David to number Israel and then punishes him for doing so;[4] and arranges that the Gentiles shall worship the host of heaven.[5] The problems involved are complicated; all we can say is that Ezekiel and his predecessors were too much occupied with the Divine Sovereignty to consider that they were reflecting formally on the Divine Justice. Modern literature makes equivalent statements in more guarded language; God is said to punish sin by allowing men to plunge deeper into sin.

Supra-human Qualities of God.

So far we have been considering qualities which God has in common, so to speak, with the higher nature in the best men. We now turn to the qualities which differentiate God from man, the Divine Transcendence. The pre-exilic prophets develop this idea to some extent, but the doctrine is seen in a much more advanced form in their successors, and Second Isaiah especially attempts something like a scientific treatment of the subject on the line of systematic dogmatics. Certain passages in *Amos* and *Jeremiah* so closely resemble Isaiah xl.-lv., that they are commonly regarded as exilic or post-exilic; and are therefore available for the study of the theology of our period.[6]

[1] Exod. vii. 3. [2] 1 Sam. xix. 9.
[3] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. [4] 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. [5] Deut. iv. 19.
[6] Amos iv. 13, v. 8, 9, ix. 5, 6. So Dillmann, p. 206; Stade, p. 220; Kayser-Marti, p. 114; Jer. x. 1-16, xxx. 10 f.

When religion is passing from the frankly anthropomorphic stage, and men begin to think about the difference between God and Man, the difference is most easily thought of as one of degree. God has the same qualities and faculties as Man, in a much fuller measure. A modern theologian in treating this branch of the subject would especially emphasise the moral superiority of God, His righteousness, justice and benevolence are infinitely beyond those of men. This idea is found in our prophets. The wickedness of men is contrasted with God's righteousness; and their fickle disloyalty with His abiding faithfulness; a mother's love may fail but God's love cannot.[1]

But our prophets do not specially dwell on the moral superiority of God; the terms in which they speak of the virtues of good men or nations, *e.g.*, the Servant of Yahweh, are not essentially different from those used of God, and we have no express declarations that the moral nature of God is far superior to that of Man. Morality does not present itself as a question of degree. As regards strength a Being very much stronger than Man may be thought of as able to accomplish by His own unaided power a task which would require the united efforts of ten thousand men. But no such concrete pictures can be constructed of superior morality.

Hence the superiority of God to man as a matter of degree is chiefly developed in connexion with non-moral faculties. God is superior in power. He is irresistible: "None can deliver out of My hand: I will work, and who can hinder".[2] He is the Creator and Ruler of the universe, and can

Omnipotence.

[1] Isa. xlix. 15. [2] Isa. xliii. 13.

deal with mountains and islands, seas and stars, the whole material earth and heaven, as men deal with small objects which they can weigh in scales, or even as men deal with the mere dust which hardly affects the scales.[1] So too He deals as He will with all human power and authority; all nations are nothing before Him; He annihilates kings and judges.[2] Things that seem impossible to men are a matter of course to God,[3] or as we might say, what men count supernatural is natural to God. These and similar expressions amount to a formal statement of the Divine omnipotence. God is superior to all forces known to the prophets, and is able to accomplish any task which they can imagine. They do not deal with the problem of the relation of God's power to the human will. Man can disobey God, he can be deaf to the Divine appeal, and blind to the Divine vision; but it is never said that God is unable to overcome the moral resistance of man.[4]

God, in His great power, is self-sufficient, independent of human ministry. Having made all things, He needs no temple.[5] The forests of Lebanon and the cattle that feed in its pastures are not sufficient to provide Him with a burnt-offering;[6] in other words, He needs no sacrifices, any possible offering that man can make is so trivial as to be of no account before Him.[7]

Again, man endures for a definite space; his life has a

[1] Isa. xl. 12, 15; Amos v. 8, 9; Jer. x. 10, 13.

[2] Isa. xl. 17, 23. [3] Zech. viii. 8.

[4] *Shaddai* is rather a personal name than a descriptive title; see p. 134.

[5] Isa. lxvi. 1. [6] Isa. xl. 16. Dillmann, p. 242.

[7] *Cf.* Ps. l.

beginning and an end; his time is limited.[1] But God is eternal, without beginning and without end. He is the first and the last;[2] His works shall endure when earth and heaven have passed away;[3] His word endures for ever;[4] no god existed before Him and none shall survive Him.[5] Yahweh is an "everlasting King".[6]

Eternity.

Man has further a measure of knowledge and wisdom; but the knowledge and wisdom of God far exceed all human attainments. He can declare "unto man what is his thought".[7] "Among all the wise men of the nations . . . there is none like unto Yahweh."[8] Yahweh alone amongst deities knows the past and the future.[9] No one can teach Him anything.[10] The seven eyes of Yahweh run to and fro throughout the earth.[11] There is no searching of His understanding.[12] Ezekiel's Cherubim are "full of eyes".

Omniscience.

The expressions of our prophets, however, are hardly definite enough to show that they had formally thought out the idea that the wisdom of God was infinite, and His knowledge all embracing; the term "omniscience" is scarcely justified for the literature we are considering.

The statement that Yahweh records the sayings and doings of the righteous in a "book of remembrance,"[13] is not necessarily a limitation of the Divine memory; it is rather an anthropomorphic figure.

[1] *Cf.* below.
[2] Isa. xli. 4, xliv. 6, xlviii. 12.
[3] Isa. li. 6.
[4] Isa. xl. 8, לְעוֹלָם, "unto the age".
[5] Isa. xliii. 10.
[6] Jer. x. 10.
[7] Amos iv. 13.
[8] Jer. x. 7.
[9] Isa. xli. 21-24.
[10] Isa. xl. 13 f.
[11] Zech. iv. 10.
[12] Isa. xl. 28.
[13] Mal. iii. 16.

But the difference between God and Man is not merely one of degree. Rightly or wrongly, at a comparatively early stage of religious psychology,[1] men thought that their experience of God made Him known to them as a Being different in kind from themselves. This interpretation of the religious consciousness may have been one of the causes of the constant efforts to avoid representing God as a Man; so that the representations of the Deity are often forms of animals; and God is worshipped in connexion with stones, trees, rivers, sun, moon, and stars, fire, light, etc. In images of gods, wings and other non-human features are introduced.

In a very different way the later prophets declare that God is not merely greater than man but a Being of another order. The idea is most exactly expressed by saying that God is "holy," *qādôsh*. The original derivation and meaning of this word are uncertain; but it is used in historic times almost as the equivalent of "divine"; it is that which God is, as God, as distinct from man or anything else. As applied to men and things, *qādôsh* = "sacred," separated from common use and consecrated to the deity, and its application to God is a natural extension of this usage; the epithet describing that which is exclusively dedicated to God is applied to God Himself.[2] It thus does not denote the ethical qualities which are common to God and Man, but the exaltation and majesty of God as contrasted

Holiness.

[1] The use of such terms is perhaps not justified for our period or earlier times. All that is meant is that men had certain religious experiences, and that they thought about them and interpreted them, forming various views or theories.

[2] Kayser-Marti, pp. 25, 130; Stade, p. 88.

with the low estate of Man. Thus Stade,[1] "Israel does not think of Yahweh's holiness as His moral elevation, but as His inviolableness[2] and unapproachableness".[3] Thus, too, Davidson,[4] "In its original use the term 'holy' . . . does not express a moral quality, . . . and when applied to Jehovah it rather expresses His transcendental attributes or that which we call Godhead, as opposed to the human. In use as applied to Jehovah it is a general term expressing Godhead."

Long before the Exile, however, *qādôsh*, just because it meant what was specially characteristic of God, had come to suggest all the Divine attributes; just as with us noble qualities and even non-moral excellence are spoken of as "divine"; *e.g.*, "a daughter of the gods, divinely tall". But the term still denoted a quality only possessed by God and that which was identified with Him. The holiness of God is a keynote of Isaiah's prophecies; one of his favourite phrases is "the Holy One of Israel,"[5] a title of God peculiar to Isaiah and writers dependent on him. Ezekiel uses the term "holy" of consecrated things and speaks of the "holy name,"[6] but he only rarely applies the term to God Himself. But the Second Isaiah takes up Isaiah's "Holy One of Israel," or more emphatically still "the Holy One";[7] and the title also occurs in the concluding chapters. By this time, however, it seems to have become a conventional title, and to be used in groups of titles, almost as a name, without any special consciousness of its distinctive force.

[1] P. 87. [2] *Unverletzlichkeit.* [3] *Cf.* Dillmann, p. 254.
[4] P. 145. [5] קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, *qĕdôsh Yisrā'ēl.*
[6] Ezek. xx. 39. [7] Isa. xl. 25, xli. 14.

But we read of God's "holy spirit,"[1] and heaven is the habitation of His Holiness and His glory.[2] The term "holy" is freely applied to Yahweh in the Law of Holiness, but the usage disappears in the later prophets, possibly because "holy" was so constantly applied to material objects and ecclesiastical officials that it no longer appeared a worthy epithet for God.

Allied to "holiness" and often connected with it is the "glory," *kābhôdh*,[3] of Yahweh. Thus the chant of the seraphim was "Holy, holy, holy, is Yahweh Çebāôth: the fulness of the whole earth is His glory".[4] Our "glory" suggests splendour or brilliance, but *kābhôdh* is from a root denoting weight, and rather refers to the power or authority of God, more especially His mysterious dominion in Nature and in the supernatural world. In Ezekiel the "Glory of Yahweh" is connected with the marvellous appearance of the Cherubim, and is sometimes used of Yahweh Himself. Isaiah lx. 1, 2 also uses this phrase. The Divine exaltation is also expressed in the title 'Elyon, "Most High," and in the phrase the "Majesty[5] of Yahweh".

The contrast between God and Man is shown by the relation of God to Nature and the Universe. Man, especially before the rise of Science, is at the mercy of Nature; his crops depend upon the sun and rain; he himself and his cattle are helpless before the pestilence. But God is the Ruler of Nature; He controls its beneficent and destructive forces.[6]

Creator, etc.

[1] Isa. lxiii. 11. [2] Isa. lxiii. 15. [3] כָּבוֹד.

[4] Isa. vi. 3. [5] גְּאוּת, *gē'ûth*, "loftiness".

[6] P. 159; *cf.* also below.

Moreover, the World and Man, Israel and the Nations, are what they are through the "creative"[1] work of God. When the prophets looked back to the beginnings of the world as they knew it, they saw Yahweh, as the Author or Creator. The use of *bara'*, "create," exclusively[2] for the initiating energy of Yahweh, implies that He possesses a power to which there is nothing exactly corresponding in Man.

A formal doctrine of the Divine Omnipresence is not yet developed. But, as we have seen,[3] the connexion of Yahweh with any special place, even with the Temple at Jerusalem, is no longer thought of in such a way as to be a limitation. The later writers think of the home of Yahweh as a high and holy place,[4] and speak of Him as the God of heaven.[5] In *Ezekiel* He is carried by living creatures full of eyes, that can move freely in all directions.[6] Thus Yahweh is in a position, so to speak, to know everything and to act everywhere; for practical purposes He is omnipresent. It is doubtful whether our literature implies that the writers thought of God as invisible or incorporeal.[7]

Omnipresence (?), etc.

Yahweh is also described as of a nature distinct from Man, and is classed with supernatural beings when He is spoken of as *'El*, *'Elohim* or *'Eloah*. Here again, whatever may be the history of the use of the plural *'Elohim* for a single deity, no significance is attached to the plural in this period; it is a mere name.

"God."

The prophets had hardly attained to the idea that God and other supernatural beings were spiritual in any sense which would not apply to Man.

[1] P. 194. [2] *Cf.* p. 181. [3] P. 144.
[4] Isa. lvii. 15, lxvi. 1. [5] Jon. i. 9. [6] Ezek. i.
[7] Dillmann, pp. 227 ff., finds these doctrines in O.T. generally.

The prophets, however, felt that none of these titles or descriptions adequately expressed the essential nature of God. Therefore they set forth the uniqueness of Yahweh. He is a Being by Himself, no other belongs to the same class. This is emphasised in the preface to the Deuteronomic Code,[1] "Yahweh, our God, Yahweh is One". The Second Isaiah returns again and again in varying phrases to this idea. "To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare to Him?"[2] "I, even I, am Yahweh; and beside me there is no deliverer."[3] "Among all the wise men of the nations and in all their royal estate, there is none like unto Thee," and as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are the ways and thoughts of Yahweh higher than those of men.[4]

Uniqueness.

But Yahweh is also unique amongst supernatural beings: "He is God in truth; He is the living God, and an everlasting king . . . while the gods that have not made earth and heaven, shall perish from the earth, and from under heaven".[5] There is no other God, before, beside, or after Yahweh; He is the only true Rock.[6] The accumulation and multiplication of titles, epithets and descriptive phrases for Yahweh is also an attempt to express the Divine uniqueness; no other God could be so spoken of. Yahweh is also unique in His knowledge of the future.[7]

[1] Deut. vi. 4. The exact translation is doubtful—see R.V. text and margin—but the general sense is clear.

[2] Isa. xl. 18, 25. [3] Isa. xliii. 11; *cf.* xlvi. 5.

[4] Jer. x. 6, 7; Isa. lv. 9. [5] Jer. x. 10, 11.

[6] Isa. xli. 4, xliii. 10, xliv. 6, 8, lxiv. 4.

[7] Isa. xli. 21-29.

Ezekiel's elaborate descriptions of the Glory of Yahweh, and his precautions for safeguarding the "sanctity"[1] of the Temple, testify, on different lines, to the prophet's sense of the unique claims and nature of Yahweh. Similar significance attaches to the interest of the post-exilic prophets in the Temple.

Negatively, the faith of our prophets in the uniqueness of Yahweh is shown by the fact that they never speak of any other supernatural being in similar terms. Even when Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah assert the claims of Yahweh as against the deities of powerful empires, it is clear that the prophets see nothing in common between the God of Israel and His rivals. The constant identification of the gods of the heathen with their material images shows how entirely Yahweh stood by Himself as the only "God in truth, and living God".

It is sometimes denied that this teaching amounts to pure monotheism. It is no doubt true that the prophets had not formally worked out the idea that God was the only independent source of life and energy.[2] At the same time it is doubtful whether Christian dogmatics have yet succeeded in including such a doctrine in a consistent scheme of theology, *e.g.*, in relation to Human Freedom. Substantially, and especially on the positive side, the prophets teach as real a monotheism as any that can be found in the New Testament or in Nicene theology.

'Elohim, as we have said, is a general term for supernatural beings, and is used freely for heathen deities;

[1] Ezek. xl.-xlviii. The obscure and complex details of Ezek. i. suggest the manifold and mysterious attributes of deity.

[2] *Cf.* below.

these are constantly identified with their images; and the possession of powers of perception and action is denied to them. In other words, the heathen faith that their gods were persons was a delusion, nothing really existed but their images, names, temples, and priesthoods. This doctrine, however, is not consistently held; but it is difficult to know how far the prophets use conventional language figuratively, and how far they themselves in their less dogmatic moments thought of the heathen gods as persons. Thus these beings are appealed to as if they could hear and answer,[1] and we read that "Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth".[2] Ezekiel's comparison of the King of Tyre to a cherub in the sacred mountain of the gods[3] perhaps implies a belief in the real existence of the heathen deities.

Other Supernatural Beings.

At any rate, to the ordinary Jew these beings were quite real,[4] and the effect of the teaching of Second Isaiah would be to create the belief that they were supernatural beings of an inferior order, not to be spoken of in the same breath with Yahweh.

In this connexion the teaching of the prophets as to the heavenly bodies has a special significance. The Babylonians and others either worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, or thought of them as closely connected with their greater deities. The prophets emphatically assert that these bodies were created and are controlled by Yahweh: "Lift up your eyes on high, and see who hath created these, that bringeth out their host by number:

[1] Isa. xli. 23. [2] Isa. xlvi. 1; *cf.* Jer. l. 2, li. 44.
[3] Ezek. xxviii. 14-16; Stade, p. 290. [4] Isa. lxv. 11; Ezek. viii.

He calleth them all by name".[1] The right hand of Yahweh spread out the heavens.[2] He maketh the Pleiades and Orion.[3] In the Day of Yahweh, "He shows wonders in the heavens, and in the earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood."[4] That which the heathen thought of as gods or as subject to their gods is really the work of Yahweh, the revelation of His power and purpose; He deals with them as He pleases.

But here also the language of the prophets suggests the existence of some kind of personality, "He calleth them all by name"; and popular thought still believed in supernatural beings connected with the heavenly bodies, but inferior and subordinate to Yahweh.

This degradation of the gods of the nation to a lower rank is naturally connected with the formulating of the doctrine of angels. Properly speaking, such a doctrine is only possible in a monotheistic religion.[5] So long as "god" is a term for a class of beings, the function of ministering to the higher gods can be discharged by inferior gods; Hermes is a god as well as Zeus. But when one Being is set apart by Himself as the only God, there arises the idea of supernatural beings of a lower order, different in kind, as well as in degree, from both God and man; the idea of angels. Thus in the ancient religion of Israel the *Mal'akh*[6] is a manifestation of Yahweh, and is usually spoken of *Mal'akh Yahweh* or *Mal'akh*

[1] Isa. xl. 26. [2] Isa. xlviii. 13.
[3] Amos v. 8. [4] Joel ii. 30 f., iii. 15.
[5] *Cf.* Gray's article on *Angels* in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.
[6] מַלְאַךְ, E.V. "Angel".

'Elohim. Yahweh does not employ supernatural intermediaries between Himself and His people. Here and there, especially in some of the later passages, there is a suggestion of such an idea, *e.g.*, in Isaiah vi., the Divine King has attendant Seraphim. But in pre-exilic times there is no real doctrine of angels.

The "Angel" proper first appears in *Ezekiel*, though he is not usually called *Mal'akh*, but simply "man"; but the functions of the "men" and their relation to Yahweh show clearly that they are supernatural ministers of God, *e.g.*, the six "men with weapons for slaughter," and the "man with the writer's ink-horn".[1] The visions of the new Israel are shown to Ezekiel by "a man, whose appearance was like the appearance of brass".[2] Similarly the visions of Zechariah are shown to him by angels, and are also partly visions of the doings of angels. They are variously spoken of as *mal'akh* and "man," "horses," and "chariots"; the latter are identified with the four winds.[3] These "angels" are the ministers of Yahweh and reveal His will. There appear to be grades among them; angels go throughout the earth and return to report to their chief.[4] In Isaiah lxii. 6 angels appear as "watchmen":[5] "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, . . . Yahweh's remembrancers". Elsewhere angels are spoken of as "the holy ones," *i.e.*, those specially devoted to the service of Yahweh.[6] Probably in this period the "hosts" of the name Yahweh Çebāôth,

[1] Ezek. ix.

[2] Ezek. xl. 3. Possibly the *Ruah* or "Spirit" of Ezek. viii. 3, etc., is to be regarded as a kind of angel.

[3] Zech. i. 7-17, vi. 1-8.

[4] Zech. i. 11.

[5] שֹׁמְרִים, *shōmĕrîm.*

[6] Dan. iv. 17.

"Lord of Hosts," were understood as armies of heaven. Possibly in the seven men of Ezekiel ix. we have an anticipation of the later idea of the seven archangels.

Ezekiel's living creatures and the "Spirit" are rather part of the manifestation of Yahweh than separate beings having relations to Him.

The primitive figure of the *Mal'akh* of Yahweh still appears, but as a kind of archangel,[1] and as a title of the prophet Haggai or of the priest.[2]

In this period we first meet with Satan[3] as a name or title of an angel. Satan or the Adversary is not an evil spirit here any more than in Job i., ii., but simply an angel discharging the special function of accusing men before God. Such a being, however, is well on the way to be an evil spirit.

When once the idea of angels was established, that of evil angels must inevitably have arisen; it would be suggested by the manifold array of demons in the Babylonian, Egyptian and other mythologies. Nevertheless there are only faint traces of such beings in our literature; supernatural evil was still practically represented by the gods of the heathen; the angels were regarded as specially connected with God, and therefore good; the name *mal'akh*, "messenger," denoted a being dependent on a chief, and could hardly be used for evil spirits until the idea had arisen of some supreme evil spirit. Hence the few traces of evil spirits are not connected with the term *mal'akh*. In Zechariah xiii. 2 we read of the "unclean spirit"; and Isaiah xxiv. 21 speaks of Yahweh punishing "the host of the high ones on high," apparently "evil spirits," possibly the heathen gods.

[1] Zech. i. 12; Mal. iii. 1.

[2] Hag. i. 13; Mal. ii. 7, E.V. "messenger". [3] שָׂטָן, Zech. iii. 1.

CHAPTER II.

GOD AND THE WORLD, NATURE.

The Old Testament writers do not formulate any theory of the World, Matter, Force, or Nature; Biblical Hebrew has no words for these ideas, still less for the Universe.[1] Moreover, the same word, *'ereç*, has to do duty for both "earth" and "land," and it is sometimes difficult to know which sense it bears. The Universe or sum of things could only be expressed by enumerating them; and even in Second Isaiah there does not seem to be any attempt at an exhaustive catalogue of the various divisions of what we should call the Universe. Here and elsewhere "earth and heaven" are often spoken of, but we do not find, for instance, in our literature "earth, heaven and Sheol". But it is clear that the prophets recognised these three as divisions of space,[2] but we cannot say whether they would have regarded them as accounting for the Universe. They do not indeed speak of the sum of things apart from God as limited, but on the other hand

[1] Dillmann, p. 284; חֶלֶד and תֵּבֵל are of limited reference, and do not include heaven or the heavenly bodies. The use of עוֹלָם for "world" is post-biblical.

[2] For Sheol, see Isa. xiv. 9; Ezek. xxxi. 15, xxxii. 21.

there is no indication of any sense of the immensity of Nature or of an illimitable space surrounding the scene of human life. If the Second Isaiah had had any such ideas he would have used them in his efforts to find worthy expression for the unique majesty of Yahweh. He does indeed appeal to the fact that God created and rules the heavenly bodies; but in describing God's dominions, the waters, heaven, the dust of the earth, the mountains and the hills, are spoken of in parallel clauses, as if they were all commensurable existences, on a somewhat similar scale.[1]

This limited view of the Universe facilitated the doctrine of a close and special connexion between Yahweh and Israel,[2] or, to follow more strictly the development of ideas, it was easier to think of the God of Israel as the one supreme Deity, the Maker and Ruler of all things, when the ratio of "all things" to Israel was finite and comparatively small.

The prophets of this period no doubt held the view of the geography, so to speak, of earth and heaven which is implied in the earlier literature and in the contemporary account of the Creation;[3] a view common to most of the Semitic peoples and illustrated by the Babylonian cosmography.[4] The earth is a vast plain with the waters of heaven above, the lower waters around and beneath, a vast ocean bounding the habitable world, and somewhere under the earth Sheol, the abode of the dead.[5] The upper waters are sustained by a solid arch or firmament, the *locus* of the heavenly bodies. We have noticed the prominence of the waters in Isaiah xl. 12. In Ezekiel's

[1] Isa. xl. 12. [2] See below. [3] Gen. i., Priestly Code.
[4] See Whitehouse, *Cosmogony*, *D.B.*
[5] P. 19.

scheme of things we must find room somewhere for Eden and the Mountain of the Gods,[1] the latter corresponding to the central sacred mountain of Babylonian theology. Possibly he may have regarded this mountain as the heavenly abode of Yahweh.

Though the prophets had no philosophical theory of matter, life and consciousness, they necessarily discerned the obvious distinctions between dead matter, vegetation, animals and man, a distinction which is fully recognised in the first chapter of *Genesis*. But the sense of such distinctions might not prevent them from attributing human faculties to beings of a lower order, whether figuratively or otherwise is uncertain.[2] Thus, "Sing, O ye heavens: for Yahweh hath wrought: shout ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein. . . . Yahweh . . . saith to the deep, Be dry."[3] Ezekiel is bidden prophesy to the mountains of Israel, "Hear the word of Yahweh, and speak to the mountains and hills, the rivers and the valleys".[4] When, too, he includes in his description of the Glory of Yahweh wheels full of eyes, and states that the spirit of the living creatures was in the eyes, he shows a lack of clear perception of the distinction between the conscious and unconscious. No modern writer, apart from dependence upon ancient mythology, would have introduced living, many-eyed wheels into a Vision of God.

Matter.

[1] Ezek. xxviii. 13-16.

[2] The term "figuratively" is only used with some hesitation. It implies a clear conscious distinction which was probably absent from the minds of the prophets; often from those of modern Orientals; sometimes from popular poetry and rhetoric in all times and places.

[3] Isa. xliv. 23, 27. [4] Ezek. xxxvi. 1, 6.

But, as we have said, Hebrew has no word for matter, and the Old Testament neither states that the material universe was created out of nothing, nor speaks of an original mass of matter from which the universe was shaped. One translation indeed of Genesis i. 1 states that in the beginning when God created the heaven and the earth, the earth was a chaos,[1] *i.e.*, chaos preceded creation; and the earlier account of the making of man[2] starts from a desolate, fog-beclouded waste. It would not follow that this chaos or waste was an ultimate, primal existence, independent of Yahweh. The Second Isaiah and the writers of his school probably intend to exclude such a view and to assert that God was the Author of all things. At any rate, the phrase "first and last"[3] would have that effect. It is true that other phrases, if pressed, would imply the use of material; *e.g.*, Jeremiah x. 16 speaks of Yahweh as "the former of all things," the word for "former" being that used for "potter," and meaning mould or shape like a potter. But this unique Potter might be thought of as creating His own clay.

The eternity or indestructibility of matter[4] as a whole is a natural axiom to a primitive people. Even if the material of the universe is thought of as created by God, yet as His work it might be permanent. Here, again, the language of the prophets is not conclusive; but on the whole it seems clear that they did not contemplate the annihilation of the present material universe. They speak, indeed, of the host of heaven melting and the heavens being rolled together as a scroll. Yahweh creates

[1] *Tōhû wa Bhōhû.* [2] Genesis ii. 4b ff.
[3] Isa. xlviii. 12. [4] Not of course the modern scientific theory.

new heavens and a new earth: and "the former shall not be remembered or come into mind".[1] But such statements may mean that the present world is resolved into its elements, from which new heavens and earth are formed. Apparently, too, there is continuity between men and things in the old dispensation and those in the new, and such continuity, according to primitive ideas, would involve a continuity of matter.

Similarly, there is no express doctrine of Spirit, nor any exhaustive statement of the ultimate relation of spiritual beings as a whole to God. In Genesis ii. 7 the life of Man is an emanation from Yahweh, who breathes into his nostrils the breath of life; an anthropomorphism which belongs to an earlier stage of thought. In a passage[2] describing the creative energy of God, it is said that He "stretcheth forth the heavens, and lays the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him". The wording "formeth" does not itself suggest creation out of nothing; and it is possible that the writer thought of the human spirit as moulded from some material. It is more probable that he did not consider the question at all. The principles of the Second Isaiah seem to imply that God is the ultimate author of spirit or of the life of living things, as well as of things without life. Spirit.

The same principles might be extended to suprahuman spiritual beings. When it is said that the host of heaven were created by Yahweh,[3] the statement may include the spirits later on identified with angels, connected with the stars. But while the prophets[4] regarded the heathen

[1] Isa. xxxiv. 4, lxv. 17.
[2] Zech. xii. 1.
[3] Isa. xl. 26.
[4] P. 167.

deities as real persons, they can hardly have thought of them as the work of Yahweh. The doctrine that they were not spirits at all but mere images would avoid this difficulty.

There are a few references to the primæval monsters of the Semitic cosmology, Rahab and Leviathan, and the Dragon,[1] and of a certain "anointed Cherub,"[2] adversaries of Yahweh. But this may be merely a literary use of myths. Primitive thought believes in evil suprahuman beings opposed to the good Deity,[3] without explaining their origin with reference to Him. Our prophets do not expressly deal[4] with this subject, but their tendency seems to be to ignore the existence of evil deities or spirits.

Good and Evil.

Morality is mainly discussed in connexion with God and man; but the presence of moral evil in the world is a somewhat different question; and is also a branch of a larger subject, the general apparent imperfection of the world involved in sin, suffering, and pain; witness the use, in Hebrew as in English, of the same terms "good,"[5] "evil,"[6] for moral and material perfection and imperfection. *Primâ facie* virtue and vice, gain and loss, happiness and suffering, stand over against each other as normal and essential phenomena of the world, and primitive thought often accepts the natural explanation of these contrasts by dualism, the theory of the activity of personal powers of

[1] תַּנִּין, Isa. xxvii. 1, li. 9.

[2] כְּרוּב מְמֻשָׁח, Ezek. xxviii. 14.

[3] Or Deities.

[4] But *cf.* below.

[5] טוֹב, *ṭôbh*.

[6] רַע, *raʿ*.

good and evil outside man. The definite emphatic statement of the creation and control of earth, heaven, and man by Yahweh excluded this view; which, indeed, is explicitly denied by Isaiah xlv. 7: "I form the light, and create darkness; I bring about prosperity,[1] and create calamity. I Yahweh do all these things." The word we have rendered calamity is *ra'*, "evil"; but it is pretty clear that in this context the reference is to material evil, to which all the connected words, "light," "darkness," "prosperity," refer. Our prophets, in common with the Old Testament generally, do not hesitate to speak of God as the Author of all kinds of material evil—disease in man and beast; drought, hail, lightning, tempest, flood, failure of crops, famine; injuries inflicted by man on man, especially the calamities of war, invasion, the wasting of the land, the sacking of cities, massacre, captivity, slavery and exile.

This material evil is regarded mainly as the instrument of God's moral government of the world; suffering is sent as the punishment of sin, and as a moral discipline for the sinner.[2] It is thus supposed to appear in experience as a consequence of sin, and the question of its existence and origin is involved in the problems of moral evil.

The doctrines of the creation of earth, heaven and man by Yahweh and of His unique omnipotent Godhead suggest the view of Genesis i. 31, "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good". It is

[1] שָׁלוֹם, E.V. "peace".

[2] For the further development of this doctrine and for its qualifications, see below.

true that "good" here applies to plants as well as to mankind and does not specially denote morality; but it is equivalent to perfect, and in the case of Man must include moral perfection. How then did Man become so bad as to necessitate the introduction of "plague, pestilence, famine, battle, murder, and sudden death"?

The primitive narrative of Genesis iii., iv., ascribes the introduction of sin into the world to the suggestion of a non-human being, a serpent; but this picturesque idea is not on the same theological level as the Priestly Code and Isaiah xl.-lxvi. Apparently the literature of our period had passed beyond the opinions of ancient Israel, but had not yet closed with the problems of the origin of moral evil in Man or of the existence of evil supra-human beings.[1]

Method and Purpose of Creation.

We have seen that some of the terms used of God as Author of the world, *e.g.*, "Former," "Maker," imply a gradual process and continued activity. Similarly Yahweh "stretcheth out the heavens; and spreads forth the earth and that which cometh from it, and gives breath to the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein".[2] The world is the work of His hand;[3] and He laid the foundations of the earth.[4] He builds His chambers in the heavens, and founds His vault on the earth.[5]

On the other hand, some passages, like Genesis i., seem to speak of created things as coming into existence at the word or command of God; He commands, *i.e.* calls, into existence the host of heaven.[6] When He calls

[1] P. 153; see also below.
[2] Isa. xlii. 5.
[3] Isa. xlv. 12.
[4] Isa. li. 13.
[5] Amos ix. 6.
[6] Isa. xlv. 12.

to earth and heaven, they stand up together, forthwith they come into existence.[1] The two classes of expressions are used probably because the writer had no exact theory on the subject, but attributed to God the various modes in which human power and authority work. Another passage resembles the teaching of the Wisdom literature as to the creative energy of the Wisdom of God: "He hath made the earth by His power, He hath established the world by His wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by His understanding".[2]

Little is said of the purpose of creation; we read indeed that Yahweh formed the earth to be inhabited,[3] *i.e.*, human life and history were a purpose of creation. The teaching as to the benevolence of God [4] further suggests that Man was made for blessedness; while the stress laid on the working of God for His Name's sake, for His own sake,[5] might imply that creation, benevolent activity, was essential to the Divine Nature.

The Upholding and Government of the World.

Any idea of creation as an act by which God made and set going a machine, which might afterwards go by itself without His intervention, would be altogether foreign to the thought of the Old Testament. The continued existence of the world and the regular action of natural processes are due to the constant working of the Divine Power and Wisdom. "He does not faint or grow weary," [6] and this untiring activity is one of the tokens of the unique deity of Yahweh. Apart from marvellous deeds like the dry-

[1] Isa. xlviii. 13; *cf.* xl. 26. [2] תְּבוּנָה, *tĕbhûnâ*, Jer. x. 12.
[3] Isa. xlv. 18. [4] P. 151. [5] P. 46.
[6] Isa. xl. 28.

ing up of the sea at the Exodus,[1] "He causeth vapours to ascend from the ends of the earth; He maketh lightnings with rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of His treasures";[2] "He createth the wind and maketh the morning darkness, . . . turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night, . . . calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out on the face of the earth".[3] Good and bad seasons are the work of Yahweh.[4] The doings of man are similarly dependent upon God.[5]

Herein too God works by His Word and His Spirit.

A striking example of the way in which God is thought of as working through the ordinary activities of man and Nature is the doctrine that He enables men to ascertain truth by casting lots.[6]

Here again for the sake of convenience we use modern terms which do not accurately express Old Testament ideas. We have seen that these do not distinguish between the direct and indirect working of God.[7] The distinction is rather between the usual and the unusual, both being equally and the same way the work of God; but even these terms must be used in a very elastic fashion. We should hardly consider a bad harvest or an illness unusual; but to the Israelite such experiences were special manifestations of God's activity. We shall best understand the Old Testament view if we abandon systematic theology and fall back on anthropomorphism. Most of a man's doings we take for

Law and Miracle.

[1] Isa. li. 10.
[2] Jer. x. 13.
[3] Amos iv. 13, v. 8; *cf.* Zech. x. 1.
[4] Hag. i. 11; Zech. viii. 12.
[5] See below.
[6] Jon. i. 7; Dillmann, p. 301.
[7] P. 183.

granted; they attract no special notice; but our attention is won by some great athletic feat, or by an important discovery in science, or the painting of a great picture. Such achievements mark a man out from amongst his fellows as a man of exceptional gifts. In the same way the ordinary doings of God, the maintenance of life and of average health, the provision of food, and so forth, are only occasionally referred to by the more profound theological thinkers; but exceptional, unparalleled displays of power and wisdom attract special attention, as proofs of the unique deity of Yahweh, or as indications of His anger against exceptional sin, or His approval of exceptional righteousness.

The Second Isaiah seems to use *bara'*, "create," for these exceptional "miraculous" acts, in which he includes the "creation" of the world, of Israel,[1] the restoration of the Jews to Palestine and the means used to bring it about.[2] We may note that Yahweh "creates" darkness and calamity,[3] the smith that forges weapons of war, and the "waster that destroys".[4] A certain moderate amount of well-being is regarded by a hopeful temperament as normal, and any conspicuous disaster is an unusual event due to the exceptional dealings of God.

Again, these marvellous acts are, as we have said, a revelation of the unique deity of Yahweh; through the Restoration the Jews know that He is the God of Israel, and men know "from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside Me; I am Yahweh, and there is none else";[5] and through the vengeance upon Gog, "I

[1] Isa. xliii. 1. [2] Isa. xli. 20. [3] Isa. xlv. 7.
[4] Isa. liv. 16. [5] Isa. xlv. 3, 6.

will be known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am Yahweh ".[1]

Another exceptional activity is the power of predicting the future, which proves the superiority of Yahweh to the so-called gods of the heathen.[2] The prophets similarly appeal to the victories of Yahweh over primæval monsters,[3] and to His dealings on behalf of Israel at special crises of its history, to the blessings conferred on Abraham,[4] to the Exodus.[5]

Many of these Divine manifestations contain elements which are miraculous in the modern sense, *i.e.*, the usual order of nature is disturbed, and changes take place suddenly without the ordinary gradual processes. Thus, on the return of the Jews to Palestine, a straight road is to be made by reducing hills and valleys to a level plain and removing all obstacles, so that the road may not turn or wind;[6] and when they are settled again in their own land, Judah shall be transformed and rendered fertile by a marvellous river issuing from the Temple, on whose bank shall grow trees bearing fruit every month.[7]

The apocalyptic pictures of the future frequently transcend the ordinary conditions of nature. In the New Jerusalem life is to be almost indefinitely prolonged, to periods like those of the antediluvian patriarchs of Genesis v., any one dying at the age of a hundred will be regarded as a child cut off in its earliest years.[8] In the Day of Yahweh " the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the ravines of Judah shall run with water, and a fountain shall come forth out

[1] Ezek. xxxviii. 23. [2] Isa. xli. 21-24. [3] P. 176.
[4] Isa. li. 2. [5] Isa. li. 10, lxiii. 11. [6] Isa. xl. 4.
[7] Ezek. xlvii. 1-12. [8] Isa. lxv. 20.

of the house of Yahweh, and shall water the valley of Shittim".[1] Similarly in Zechariah xiv. 8, 10, living waters are to flow from Jerusalem, half towards the Mediterranean and half towards the Dead Sea, and all the land is to be turned into a plain.

But wherever they occur, the miraculous elements, as we should call them, are combined with what we should regard as the results of the ordinary operations of Nature and Providence, earthquakes, fertility, the conquests of Cyrus, and so forth; and there is nothing to show that the prophets drew any distinction between them as forming two separate classes of phenomena. To them the sudden formation of a new river or the flowing of mountains with milk were not miraculous but only extraordinary. Indeed, in one case where special attention is drawn to an event as exceptionally marvellous, it is one which was or would have been wrought by the usual methods of Providence—the return of the Jews from exile: "Who hath heard such a thing? Who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children."[2] This passage may be compared with those which speak of prediction[3] as a special attribute of Yahweh.

Our prophets do not refer to anything similar to the miracles of Elisha and Elijah, though such narratives must have been current in their time. Isaiah xl.-lv. does not use these as Christian apologists have used the miracles of Christ. Similar marvels were recounted of Egyptian and Babylonian priests and magicians. Hence

[1] Joel iii. 18. [2] Isa. lxvi. 8. [3] Pp. 165 f.

the apology of the exilic prophets appealed to the evidence which showed Yahweh to be supreme in Nature and History. They traced one Divine purpose controlling the rise and fall of the greatest nations; this purpose was the moral and spiritual discipline of Israel; therefore the God of Israel was the one true God. In this respect the Old Testament was more scientific than the apologists of the Middle Ages and the scholastic period of the Reformation.

The experiences of Jonah stand by themselves. The marvellous element is not told for its own sake, it is merely part of the machinery of an allegory. Even if the narrative is supposed to be told as sober fact, it does not follow that the doings of the great fish and the fortunes of the gourd are regarded as outside of God's ordinary providential control of Nature. Some recent apologists have tried to show that cases have occurred of men being swallowed and ejected by fishes,[1] so that Jonah's adventure could have been brought about by natural means. If such views can be held now, they were much more possible in the centuries before Christ.

[1] See König, *Jonah*, *D.B.*, ii., 750*b*.

CHAPTER III.

GOD AND MAN, THE GENTILES.

THE general doctrine of Man is dealt with at length later; here we specially consider the relation of God to Man as part of the doctrine of God. This relation, as we have said,[1] is seen in its ideal form in the relation of God to Israel, which will be dealt with separately; but we have to consider the prophetic teaching as to God and Mankind apart from His connexion with Israel, a subject which includes the question of the position of the heathen. It is important to remember that normally the prophets were only interested in the heathen so far as their doings and circumstances affected Israel; they only thought of them with a sympathetic concern, when they were moved by a special inspiration or touched by some great tragedy like the fall of Nineveh.

Man, as part of the world, had been created by God; the existence of the race was maintained by the continued exertion of the Divine power; Yahweh "calls the generations" from first to last; He sustains their life from day to day, giving them breath and spirit.[2] According to the accounts of the Creation in Genesis i., ii., the world was

[1] P. 154. [2] Isa. xli. 4, xlii. 5.

made for the sake of Man; our prophets are clear that it exists for the sake of Israel; how far it subserves a larger purpose is not always obvious. We shall further consider the point in connexion with the Gentiles.

Again, God and the individual is a subject that is only fully treated in our literature in terms of God and the Israelite, though elsewhere the Book of Job discusses the question quite apart from Israel—unless Job himself is Israel in allegory.

Here and there the prophetic literature touches upon some individual outside Israel, but they are exceptional persons and only slightly illustrate the dealings of God with the individual as man. Indeed, for the most part such a subject is ignored; we have to consider not man, but Jew or Gentile. Little can be gathered from the passing references to ancient worthies like Noah, Job and Daniel.[1]

The prophets do not deal with Mankind as a race, but as an aggregate of nations, with Israel on the one side and the heathen on the other. They are never tired of describing the events of international politics as the working of the Divine Providence, God's government of His world. Each of the greater prophetical books has a section setting forth the judgments upon the various peoples with which Israel was most closely connected. They and their rulers are the instruments of the purposes of Yahweh; Cyrus and Nebuchadrezzar are His creatures and agents; Cyrus is His shepherd and His anointed. Nebuchadrezzar and his army work for Yahweh when

[1] Ezek. xiv. 14. Daniel here is not the hero of the Book of Daniel, but the subject of some lost tradition.

they besiege Tyre, and because they fail to take it, they receive Egypt as their wages.[1]

The prophetic doctrine of the Gentiles might for the most part be expressed by saying that, like Nature,[2] they are the instruments of God's moral discipline of Israel. When David sins, pestilence, famine, or an invasion by a heathen enemy are named as possible punishments;[3] when the time of Israel's restoration has come, Cyrus and his armies overturn the whole international system of the ancient world[4] in order that the Jews may return to Palestine. In the apocalyptic pictures of the future the Gentiles sometimes appear as the slaves and tributaries of Israel.[5] Elsewhere they are excluded as unclean from the service of the Temple and even from Jerusalem.[6]

Gentiles.

But sometimes even in announcing the doom of heathen nations the prophets speak of them with sympathetic interest. In one of the exilic oracles on the fall of Babylon[7] we read, "we would have healed Babylon"; and again, "I was bowed down at the hearing of it, I was dismayed at the seeing of it". Ezekiel writes with evident admiration and wonder of the glory of Tyre.

Other passages, however, show that God includes the Gentiles in His purposes in ways that are not altogether subsidiary to the interests of Israel. They may become sharers in the spiritual privileges of Israel. Naturally in the teaching of Jewish prophets, Israel retains its ecclesiastical pre-eminence; Jerusalem and its Temple

[1] Isa. xli. 2, xliv. 28, xlv. 1; Ezek. xxix. 20. [2] P. 177.
[3] 2 Sam. xxiv. 13. [4] As known to Israel.
[5] Isa. xlv. 14, xlix. 23, lx. 10-14, lxi. 5, lxvi. 20.
[6] Ezek. xliv. 9; Joel iii. 17. [7] Jer. li. 9; Isa. xxi. 1-10.

remain the sole seat of the worship of Yahweh; the one centre and source of Divine Revelation; the spiritual, and sometimes also the political, metropolis of the world. In some passages the chief privilege of the Gentiles seems to be to make lavish contributions of their wealth to the Temple. "All they from Sheba shall come, they shall bring gold and incense, and they shall show forth the praises of Yahweh."[1] The Temple is to be filled with the treasures of all the nations.[2] But the remnant of Gentiles are also described as worshipping at the Temple, and especially as attending at the great feasts,[3] though their zeal is apparently somewhat perfunctory, as it has to be enforced by heavy penalties.[4] We read also that on new moons and Sabbaths all flesh shall worship before Yahweh.[5] "Many peoples and mighty nations shall come to worship Yahweh Çebāôth in Jerusalem, and to pray before Yahweh"; but in strict subordination to Israel: "Ten men out of all the languages of the nations shall take hold of the skirt of a Jew, and say, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you".[6] It is also said more graciously that "Many nations shall be joined to Yahweh and be My people," but still Yahweh dwells in the midst of thee, *i.e.*, of Israel.[7]

Such passages are concerned with nations, but the question of proselytes or individual converts to Judaism is also dealt with. The individual Gentile is not excluded from the privileges of the Chosen People because his

[1] Isa. lx. 6. [2] Hag. ii. 7.

[3] Zech. xiv. 16; *cf.* the obscure Zech. ix. 7. [4] Zech. xiv. 17-19.

[5] Isa. lxvi. 23. I am not certain that "all flesh" refers to any one outside Israel.

[6] Zech. viii. 22 f. [7] Zech. ii. 11.

nation may still be indifferent to Yahweh, but he only attains to salvation by becoming a Jew. The "stranger"[1] who joins himself to Yahweh and keeps the Sabbath, may worship at the Temple, and his offerings will be accepted. Such acceptance, however, is a special act of condescension on the part of Yahweh, for it is also extended to eunuchs.[2] Ezekiel also accords full religious and political rights to "strangers".[3]

But another group of passages show a much more liberal attitude towards the Gentiles; God accepts their worship of their own deities as offered to Himself.[4] The Book of Jonah describes God as full of compassion towards the Gentile city of Nineveh; He sends a prophet to move its people to repentance that they may be saved from ruin. He rebukes the intolerant reluctance of Jonah to accept a Divine call to such missionary work. The heathen sailors risk their own lives in an attempt to save Jonah, and are converted to the worship of Yahweh. Isaiah lxvi. 19 speaks of men sent to declare the glory of Yahweh to those who have not heard of His mighty acts. Above all, in the Servant passages the calling and mission of Israel is to be a light to the Gentiles and "My salvation[5] unto the ends of the earth," so that God can say "Look unto Me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else".[6]

Possibly[7] one of the later prophets even anticipated the admission of Gentiles into the priesthood of the Temple;

[1] גֵּר, *gēr*, in ancient Israel a resident alien, in later times a proselyte.

[2] Isa. lvi. [3] Ezek. xlvii. 22. [4] Mal. i. 11; *cf.* p. 101.

[5] Isa. xlix. 6. [6] Isa. xlv. 22. [7] Isa. lxvi. 20; *cf.* p. 110.

and a passage that is sometimes[1] ascribed to our period declares that "Israel shall be the third with Egypt and Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom Yahweh Çebāôth shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hand, and Israel Mine inheritance". If this is not Isaianic or pre-exilic, Egypt and Assyria must be the Greek kingdoms of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. These states, the Gentile powers with which the Jews were chiefly concerned, are thought of as forming with them the new Kingdom of God.

Something needs to be said as to the relation of Yahweh to the separate Gentile nations. The statements of the prophets on this head must not be pressed. According to primitive views, indeed, Yahweh as the God and Champion of Israel is the enemy of its foes, and hates those peoples whose interests and conduct are injurious to His Chosen People. In a measure the later prophets continue to speak in this fashion, but their language must often be regarded as conventional. The Gentile nations are no longer obnoxious to Yahweh simply because they are troublesome to Israel, but on moral grounds and because their policy is a hindrance to the true faith.[2] In some cases the prophets seem to attribute an unjust malice to Yahweh where they really only intend to describe the actual course of events. We may take the most striking instance. Almost all the prophets of our period attack Edom, and Malachi adduces the Divine severity towards Edom as a proof of God's love to Israel: "I have loved you, saith Yahweh,

[1] Isa. xix. 24, 25. [2] See below.

yet ye say, Wherein hast Thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother? yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau."[1]

The moral failure of Edom may have called for harsh treatment. Professor G. A. Smith writes: "Edom was a people of as unspiritual and self-sufficient a temper as ever cursed any of God's human creatures. Like their ancestor they were *profane*, without repentance, humility or ideals, and almost without religion. Apart, therefore, from the long history of war between the two peoples, it was a true instinct which led Israel to regard their brother as representative of that heathendom against which they had to realise their destiny in the world as God's own nation."[2] Without denying a large measure of truth in this view, we are not sure that such strong language is quite justified. We know nothing about Edom except from its hereditary enemies the Jews; if we had Edomite literature, we might discover redeeming features. Moreover, it is not clear that the moral or spiritual qualities of Edom are in question here.

For the "hate" here is equivalent to treat with severity, popular language would hardly discriminate. The "hate" is explained by the following words, "and made his mountains a desolation and gave his heritage to the jackals of the wilderness". The prophet is not thinking of any hostile feeling towards Edom, but finds a proof of the Divine affection for Israel in the fact that its lot is superior to that of its neighbour.[3] We may compare our Lord's saying that His followers must "hate" father and mother.[4]

[1] Mal. i. 2.
[2] *The Twelve*, ii., 350.
[3] *Cf.* pp. 97 ff.
[4] Luke xiv. 26.

CHAPTER IV.

GOD AND ISRAEL.

The gracious attributes of God, His power, wisdom and righteousness, His patience, benevolence and love, are chiefly set forth in the Old Testament in the account of His dealings with Israel as a nation. The existence of a special, unique bond between Yahweh and Israel is a fundamental axiom of all the inspired writers. Nor is this bond merely taken for granted and ignored; it is constantly insisted on as the most precious and important truth of Hebrew religion.

The God of Israel.

The most exact and characteristic statement of this truth is in such phrases as "the God of Israel," "the Holy One of Israel," "Your God," "Our God," "Your Holy One," and the converse, "My people," "My Servant," "My Inheritance".[1]

There is also a constant antithesis in this respect between Israel and the Gentiles. The Gentiles have their own gods.[2]

The land of Israel is the land of Yahweh; He dwells on Zion, and the Temple at Jerusalem is His only legitimate sanctuary.[3]

[1] Pp. 145 f.; Isa. xlvii. 6. [2] Deut. iv. 19; Jer. ii. 11.
[3] P. 143 ff.

The bond between Yahweh and Israel existed from the very beginning of the existence of the nation. He formed Jacob and called him from the womb;[1] He appointed a people of old.[2] Yahweh called Abraham and Sarah and blessed them;[3] He dealt graciously with Israel from the times of Egypt and the Exodus; and His loving Providence followed them throughout their history.[4] His presence and help are with His people continually: "I Yahweh thy God will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not; I will help thee".[5]

The bond between Israel and Yahweh is permanent and cannot be broken; it will endure for ever. Yahweh is so essentially the God of Israel that for His own sake, for His Name's sake, He must deliver His people.[6] For a time He may "forsake" or chastise them, but such dealings are brief episodes in long ages of blessing.[7] He binds Himself to Israel by the solemn obligation of a covenant; and His loving-kindness shall endure when the mountains have passed away.[8] This covenant shall be for ever.[9] Israel shall survive the existing dispensation, and shall be as permanent as the new era which God is about to establish: "As the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before Me, saith Yahweh, so shall your seed and your name remain".[10]

Yahweh consecrates[11] Israel to Himself, so that Israel

[1] Isa. xliv. 2, xlix. 1. [2] Isa. xlix. 7.
[3] Isa. li. 2. [4] Isa. lxiii. 7 ff., lxv. 1, 2; Ezek. xvi., xxiii.
[5] Isa. xli. 13. [6] P. 46. [7] Isa. liv. 7, 8.
[8] Isa. liv. 10.
[9] Isa. lv. 3; Ezek. xvi. 60; Ezek. xxxvii. 26.
[10] Isa. lxvi. 22; *cf.* Joel iii. 20.
[11] Ezek. xxxvii. 28.

in the ideal future will be consecrated to Yahweh, *qadosh*, "holy,"[1] a nation of priests;[2] all Jerusalem will be a sanctuary in which the meanest objects will be consecrated like the vessels of the Temple.[3] The nation attains to Divine attributes, it shares the eternity of Yahweh; we might almost say, to use the Nicene terminology, that Israel becomes "of one substance" with God.

The Calling of Israel.

How then did this relationship originate? How did Yahweh come to be the God of Israel? Why was Israel more to Him than Babylon or Egypt? In primitive times the question could hardly have been asked; a nation and its god were parts of an organic whole; the one could not exist without the other; one might as well ask why a man had his own soul and not somebody else's.[4] A tradition, however, existed that Yahweh had first become known to and formed a covenant with Israel at Sinai.[5]

The language of our prophets is sometimes determined by the ancient idea of an organic relationship between Yahweh and Israel, independent of any originating act of volition on either side. Israel is the "possession," or family estate,[6] of Yahweh; Yahweh is the "Portion"[7] of Jacob. Yahweh is Next-of-kin[8] to Israel, and its King.

But the relationship is often based on the fact that Yahweh was the Creator, Former, Maker,[9] and the

[1] Isa. lxii. 12. [2] Isa. lxi. 6.
[3] Zech. xiv. 20, 21. [4] P. 145. [5] Exod. vi. 3.
[6] נַחֲלָה, *nahălâ*, E.V. "inheritance," Isa. xlvii. 6.
[7] חֵלֶק, *ḥeleq*, Jer. x. 16.
[8] *Goel*, p. 147. [9] Pp. 136 f.

Father[1] of Israel; *i.e.*, that the nation owed its existence as a nation to Him.

Again, Yahweh is spoken of as calling or choosing[2] Israel, or entering into a covenant with Israel. Yahweh becomes the God of Israel in the first instance by His choice, and also in a measure because Israel accepts Him as its God. There is a covenant or mutual agreement between them. Hence Yahweh is frequently spoken of as the Husband or Bridegroom of Israel.[3] In the ancient East, as far as the married couple themselves were concerned, the marriage was mainly the act of the husband; he virtually purchased the wife; still she was a consenting party. Ezekiel gives a peculiar turn to this figure of the marriage relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Speaking of Jerusalem, which had come to stand for Israel, he writes: "Thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan; thy father was an Amorite, thy mother a Hittite". Then he describes Jerusalem as an abandoned infant, left to perish; Yahweh adopts it and makes it His bride.[4] Thus Yahweh, and Yahweh only, has any natural claims on Israel. He is Father and Husband in one.

This last passage suggests that we might not be unduly modern if we said that the prophets teach that Yahweh centres in Himself all possible claims upon Israel, including all that man can have against man on the ground of any natural or official relationship, or any service rendered.

The terms used of the relation of God to Israel, Father,

[1] Pp. 136 f. [2] Isa. xli. 8 f.
[3] Ezek. xvi. 8, xxiii. 4. [4] Ezek. xvi. 1-4.

Husband, King, Master, imply moral obligations and a moral discipline. Israel is not a spoilt child; God is constantly inculcating righteousness; He punishes the sins of His people.[1] The final purpose of the calling of Israel is the salvation of the Gentiles.[2]

Moral Aspects.

Some of the problems raised through God's relation to Man are again suggested by His relation to Israel. God created, made, formed the nation, why was it so consistently wicked? Why did the child of a Divine Father turn out so badly? Or again, God chose Israel as a man chooses his wife. Why did He choose such a people? The prophets do not discuss these difficulties, and probably did not feel them. The special relation of God to Israel was an ultimate fact by which everything else was explained. Ezekiel indeed compares the election of Israel to the adoption of an abandoned infant, so that we might say that it was the helpless misery of the people which appealed to the Divine compassion. But Israel was not more wretched than other peoples. An explanation, however, is involved in the prophetic treatment of the history. Somehow, in spite of its shortcomings, and even through its shortcomings, Israel proved to be the true medium for God's Revelation of Himself to the world.[3]

We may also ask: Did not God—who created all things—create other nations besides Israel? What was the origin of Egypt or Babylon? Did they come into existence apart from God? Amos[4] had taught that Yahweh brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the

[1] *Cf.* below.
[2] Isa. xlix. 6.
[3] Kayser-Marti, p. 151.
[4] Amos ix. 7.

Syrians from Kir as He brought Israel out of Egypt. The later prophets ignore the question; but they suggest an answer similar to that given to previous similar problems. The significance of the Gentile nations in respect to the purpose of God in Revelation did not lie in their origin or in the circumstances of their early history, but in their relation to Israel; hence the prophets are not concerned with their creation.

The relation of God to the individual Israelite can for the most part be more conveniently dealt with later on under the Doctrine of Man from the converse point of view of the relation of the individual to God. As the God of a nation, Yahweh was necessarily the God of its members, but as members of a community. The prophets, indeed, are mainly occupied with the nation, but they make it clear that the moral nature of God's relation to His people implies His care for individuals. The morality with which they are concerned seldom refers to the conduct of Israel as a nation towards other nations, but to the behaviour of the Israelites to each other. God requires mutual good faith, justice, generosity, and good feeling within His people. "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother?"[1]

The Individual.

God's dealings with the nation are largely through prophets, priests, judges, leaders, and kings, and therefore afford examples of His relation to the individual. In these dealings He does not merely use His agents as instruments for His purposes towards Israel; He does

[1] Mal. ii. 10.

not treat them as mere officials, but takes a personal interest in their character and welfare. Ezekiel takes up a lamentation for the princes of Israel; there is a personal judgment upon Zedekiah because he broke his oath to the King of Babylon; and Yahweh forbids Ezekiel to mourn for his wife, whom yet He speaks of sympathetically as "the desire of thy heart".[1] Yahweh takes a kindly interest in the family life of His prophet, and honours it by making it a symbol of His message to Israel.

[1] Ezek. xix., xvii. 11-21, xxiv. 15-17.

CHAPTER V.

REVELATION.

The relation of God to the World, Man and Israel involves a constant Divine activity, one aspect of which is Revelation, or the making known by God to Man of His nature and will and other truth. The initiative in the relations and reactions, so to speak, between God and the World and Man[1] always lies with God. He creates all things and is the Father of His people; He chooses Israel and is its Husband. Similarly human knowledge of God is due to His self-communication: "If men know God, it is because He has made Himself known to them. This knowledge is due to what He does, not to what men themselves achieve. . . . The idea of man reaching to a knowledge or fellowship of God through his own efforts is wholly foreign to the Old Testament. God speaks, He appears; man listens, and beholds."[2] The Servant of Yahweh and Ezekiel are called of God to the prophetic mission. The "word of Yahweh" comes to Joel, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. At times Yahweh almost forces

Aspect of Divine Activity.

[1] We use "Man" to include Israel where the latter is not specified.

[2] *A.B.D.*, p. 34.

Himself upon men: "I am found of them that sought Me not. I said, Behold Me, behold Me, unto a nation that was not called by My name. I have spread out My hands all the day unto a rebellious people."[1]

On the one hand, all the operations of God and their results are a revelation. The World and Man as His creation set forth His unique deity; which is further illustrated by the processes of Nature,[2] especially in any marvellous work; the wilderness is transformed into a well-watered forest that men "may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of Yahweh hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it".[3]

As God controls the fortunes of the nations, history is a further revelation; more especially the history of Israel.[4]

But the self-communication of God to man, the unfolding and setting forth of His nature and will, are a distinct work of God: "He declareth unto man what is His thought".[5]

Professor Davidson states:[6] "There are two elements in the history of revelation which Scripture singles out as spheres wherein God is specially known—*miracle* and *prophecy*," where the context shows that by prophecy he means prediction. This is hardly correct for the literature with which we are dealing. Stress is indeed laid on prediction;[7] but we have shown that if we speak of

[1] Isa. lxv. 1, 2. [2] Pp. 180 ff.

[3] Isa. xli. 18-20. [4] P. 193.

[5] Amos iv. 13. The text and translation are doubtful, but the sentence, in any case, may serve to summarise much of the Old Testament teaching concerning Revelation.

[6] *A.B.D.*, p. 81. [7] P. 160.

"miracle" in this connexion, we must understand the word in a very different sense to that which it has in modern popular religious literature.[1] According to our prophets God is known alike in Nature and History, in the teaching of His inspired messengers, the prophets, and through the influence of His Spirit upon His people. The revelation in Nature and History is chiefly mediated through the interpretation of phenomena and events by the prophets.

We may next consider the organs and agents of Revelation. Here again the statements of the Old Testament are necessarily anthropomorphic; we read of the hands and arm, the mouth and voice of God. But in what we may call the special organs of Revelation the anthropomorphic element is slight.

Means of Revelation.

First and most important we have the Spirit, *rûaḥ*,[2] of Yahweh. Man also has a *rûaḥ*. As in other languages, the word for "spirit" originally meant "wind," and as used of a living creature "breath".[3] The comparatively immaterial character of wind or breath made the word an appropriate term for a function or faculty of man which did not seem to be lodged in any special part of the body. Then *rûaḥ* came to mean a similar faculty or function in God.

Spirit.

Spirit, *Rûaḥ*, is freely applied to the Divine activity. Naturally the special use of *rûaḥ* in connexion with God is influenced by its concurrent use in the sense of "wind". Thus, "the grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because

[1] P. 180. [2] רוּחַ.

[3] Job xvii. 1, etc.

the Spirit of Yahweh bloweth upon it,"[1] where "Spirit of of Yahweh" includes the idea of a hot wind sent from Yahweh, and that of the spirit or life of Yahweh active in the wind. Similarly in the vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, Ezekiel is bidden[2] "Prophesy unto the *Rûaḥ*. . . . Thus saith the Lord Yahweh, Come from the four winds, *ruhoth*, O *Rûaḥ*, and breathe upon these slain"; and again, "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh . . . Oh, My people, I will put my *Rûaḥ* in you, and ye shall live". The double sense of *Rûaḥ* enables the prophet to suggest with dramatic brevity the Spirit or active life of God as originating and renewing human life, and also the swift, invisible, enveloping movement of the Spirit like that of mighty winds.

In many cases the phrase Spirit of Yahweh is a periphrasis used to avoid a too crude anthropomorphism.[3] Thus the Divine Glory appears to Ezekiel; the hand of the Lord Yahweh falls upon him. He sees, as before, the appearance of a man: "and He put forth the form of an hand, and took me by a lock of mine head, and the Spirit lifted me up between earth and heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem".[4] The interposition of "Spirit" like that of "form," "appearance" and "vision," avoids the crude statement that Yahweh carried the prophet by his hair from Chaldea to Jerusalem.

In our prophets the Spirit of Yahweh is almost exclusively Yahweh Himself as active in Creation, as communicating His Divine Life and Power to His people, as in the vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, or

[1] Isa. xl. 7.
[2] Ezek. xxxvii. 9, 14.
[3] Stade, p. 100.
[4] Ezek. viii. 1-3.

even asserting Himself in the destructive processes of Nature.[1] The Spirit of Yahweh is "poured forth" upon His people, *i.e.*, it comes upon them, embraces, encompasses, pervades and penetrates them as the wind blows in and about a tree,[2] and is to them a source of life and blessing: "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour My Spirit upon thy seed, and My blessing upon thine offspring".[3] It is by the Spirit of Yahweh that Israel and its heroes were inspired for their great achievements: "He remembered the days of old, Moses and His people, saying, Where is He that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of His flock? Where is He that put His holy Spirit within Him. . . . The Spirit of Yahweh caused him to rest, so didst Thou lead Thy people."[4]

The action of the Spirit is sometimes spoken of as distinct from the Divine direction of the energies of the nations. Thus the word of Yahweh to Zerubbabel is that his task is to be accomplished "Not by power, nor by might, but by My Spirit".[5] Because the Spirit abides with the Jews according to God's ancient covenant, they need not fear.[6] The same Spirit is an ethical force, producing obedience to the will of God.[7]

The Spirit of Yahweh is the organ of Revelation as being sometimes an aspect and sometimes a variety of the Divine activity. The Servant of Yahweh is equipped with the Spirit that he may receive and deliver God's

[1] Isa. xl. 7.

[2] The figure is not an Old Testament one, but it sums up the ideas suggested by the various texts.

[3] Isa. xliv. 3. [4] Isa. lxiii. 11, 14. [5] Zech. iv. 6.

[6] Hag. ii. 5. [7] Ezek. xxxvi. 27.

message: "Behold My servant, I have put My Spirit upon him; he shall make known true religion[1] to the Gentiles".[2] "The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me, in that Yahweh has anointed me to preach good tidings."[3] When the Spirit is poured out upon all flesh, men prophesy, dream dreams, and see visions.[4] When God speaks to Ezekiel, the prophet is enabled to receive the message because the Spirit enters into him and sets him upon his feet; and the Spirit carries him from place to place that he may behold various visions and receive and deliver messages from God to the people; the Spirit of Yahweh falls upon him and bids him speak.[5] It was in His Spirit that Yahweh Çebāôth sent His messages to Israel by the ancient prophets.[6]

Therefore the Spirit, the same activity which works in Nature and Providence, also operates in Revelation.

Having spoken of the work of the Spirit, we turn next to Its Nature. On this our texts have little to say; the title "Holy Spirit"[7] is a synonym[8] for "Divine Spirit," "Spirit of Yahweh". The Spirit of Yahweh creating and controlling the world[9] needs no instruction or advice from Man. Thus the Spirit is thought of as active; in other words it is, as we have said, the Divine Activity. As such it is naturally spoken of as having Divine and even personal attributes—the Holy Spirit of Yahweh is grieved;[10] and even as separate from Yahweh and in

[1] מִשְׁפָּט, *mishpāt*, E.V. "judgment"; for this sense of *mishpāt* see Skinner, *C.B.S.*, on this passage.

[2] Isa. xlii. 1. [3] Isa. lxi. 1. [4] Joel ii. 28.
[5] Ezek. ii. 2, iii. 14, viii. 3, xi. 1, 5. [6] Zech. vii. 12.
[7] Isa. lxiii. 11, 14. [8] P. 161. [9] Isa. xl. 13.
[10] Isa. lxiii. 10.

relation to Him. The Spirit, for instance, carries Ezekiel to and from the presence of Yahweh.[1] But probably these are mere necessities of language, and could be paralleled by expressions used in modern literature of a man and his soul or his will.

It is doubtful how far we have any right to raise the question of the Personality of the Spirit in connexion with the Scriptures of the Jewish Canon. Dillmann finds the idea of the "Holy Spirit" as a Being in Itself, as distinct from "God's Holy Spirit," first in the *Psalms of Solomon* and the *Targum of Onkelos*.[2] Doubtless the Jews were subject to the common tendency to think of a variety of names as representing a plurality of persons; but the texts do not indicate the presence of the idea of the Spirit as a Being in personal relationship to God. If we could follow with confidence the English Version in Isaiah xlviii. 16, "the Lord Yahweh and His Spirit hath sent me," we might find the idea there; but the text and translation are doubtful, and the meaning probably is Yahweh hath sent me with, possessed by, His Spirit.[3]

It is possible, indeed, that we should understand by Ezekiel's "the Spirit," *ha-Rûaḥ*,[4] an "intermediate being"[5] or angel; but if so, this Spirit is not to be identified with the Spirit of Yahweh elsewhere.

The question might be raised, What is the relation of the Spirit of Yahweh dwelling in a hero or prophet, and

[1] P. 202.

[2] P. 345; *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 42; *Targ. Onk.* on Gen. xlv. 47.

[3] So, for instance, Skinner, *Isaiah*.

[4] Without the defining "of Yahweh".

[5] *Mittelwesen*, Stade, p. 291.

the same Spirit in Yahweh? Davidson[1] denies that the Spirit is ever thought of as a substance communicated to men; it always remains God. The language, however, of our authors would not be inconsistent in some cases with the idea of a temporary emanation.

The ruling ideas as to the Nature of Yahweh are well summed up by Davidson[2] thus: "The idea of the Spirit of God, like other ideas, is probably formed upon the idea of the spirit of man. The spirit of man is not something distinct from man, it *is* man. The thinking, willing life within man, manifesting itself in influences on what is without, is his spirit. The spirit of God, however, may be spoken of as outside His being or as within it. It is His Nature, not conceived, however, as *substance* or *cause*, but as moral, personal life. It may feel within Him, or be efficient without Him."

A word may be said as to the relation of the teaching of our prophets on this subject, and that of the older literature. The Spirit of Yahweh is not prominent in the pre-exilic prophets;[3] but appears in the history as possessing the heroes of Israel for great achievements; it leaps upon Saul and departs from him. We even read of an evil Spirit of Yahweh,[4] *i.e.*, a Spirit inflicting injury. The Spirit is a special and transient activity. The ideas of the Spirit of Yahweh as the source and sustaining influence of the life of Nature and Man, and as the ethical

[1] P. 127. [2] Pp. 116 f.

[3] Isa. xi. 2 is perhaps not pre-exilic. In Mic. ii. 7 Wellhausen renders "ist Jahve kurzathmig geworden?"—"Has Yahweh become short of breath?"

[4] 1 Sam. xi. 6, xvi. 14, 23.

and spiritual force making for righteousness and bestowing Revelation, originate in our period.[1]

Another organ of Revelation is the "Word," *dābhār*;[2] here, again, we can trace the desire to avoid anthropomorphism. We read of God speaking, and of the mouth and lips of God; but the "mouth of God," for instance, is not used as a special term for an organ of Revelation. The spoken word as a sound is less material, and as the vehicle of thought is more closely allied to the spiritual nature. Hence the "Word of Yahweh," or "the Word," is used specially for a communication of the Divine will or purpose, and then for a Divine activity or faculty making such communications. In later developments the "Word" was spoken of almost as a separate entity. In our literature the term is chiefly used in the formula "the word of Yahweh came" to such and such a prophet. But we also have the doctrine of the immutability of the Word, *i.e.*, the revealed Will or purpose of God: "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall endure for ever".[3] "My word . . . shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and shall prosper in that whereto I sent it."[4] While the Spirit is the general Divine activity, the Word is the special revelation or the exertion of the Divine will; these two usages naturally springing out of the two meanings of "word" as a statement or a command. The Spirit inspires the prophet that he may receive and deliver His message, which is given to him by the Word.

The Word.

[1] Isa. xl. 13, xliv. 3, etc.; Ezek. xxxvii. 14, xxxix. 29; Stade, pp. 294, 306.

[2] דָּבָר. [3] Isa. xl. 8. [4] Isa. lv. 11.

The doctrine of the Divine Wisdom as an organ of Revelation belongs to the Wisdom literature. This attribute of God is hardly referred to in our books; the chief passage is that which describes how "He established the world by His wisdom, and stretched out the heavens by His understanding".[1] In *Second Isaiah* and *Ezekiel* "wisdom" is chiefly a perverted gift of heathen nations and princes.

The Glory of Yahweh.

God manifests Himself to Ezekiel in His "Glory," through which the prophet receives revelations. This treatment of the "Glory"[2] is peculiar to Ezekiel, and probably arises out of his susceptibility to visions. The sense of the presence of God and the arising of convictions as to Divine truth seem to have been associated in his mind with images of vague, mysterious majesty. The forms of these images may have been partly suggested by the huge symbolic figures, half-human, half-animal, of the Babylonian temples; but the images were called up by the impression made upon the prophet's mind by the grandeur of Nature combined with the sense of fellowship with God.

Israel.

The Divine organs of Revelation addressed themselves to human recipients. We are not told that God reveals Himself to the human race, or to the individual man. Revelation is given in the first instance to Israel. Yahweh gives profitable instruction to Israel.[3] To Israel the prophets were sent and the *Torah*[4] was given. Deliverance and chastisement were object-lessons for the Chosen People. As the Servant of Yahweh[5] Israel is taught of God and becomes His missionary

[1] Jer. li. 15. [2] P. 163. [3] Isa. xlv. 19.
[4] See below. [5] Pp. 51 ff.

to the world. A time is thought of in the ideal future when each individual Israelite will be in direct fellowship with God, and receive intimations of His will without the intervention of any ecclesiastical official.[1]

But the Revelation to Israel was for the most part made through individual human agents, specially called to such work. The most important class of these agents was that of the prophets.[2]

Prophets.

In our period the function of the prophet was to declare to the people the will of God; their commission included prediction or the announcement of the Divine purpose for the future, and a special importance was attached to this element.[3] But prediction was not the characteristic of the prophet, it was only one feature of his work. Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah are much occupied with the inspired interpretation of Nature and history;[4] but both they and their successors[5] deal chiefly with the present needs and duties of the people, and only refer to the past and the future in order to guide and influence their hearers in the present. A careful distinction must be drawn between mere officials and the subjects of special inspiration. There was a large class of men living by prophecy as a profession. The canonical prophets shared with this class the title *nābhî'*,[6] and prob-

[1] Joel ii. 28; *cf.* Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, "I will put My *Torah* within them, and write it in their hearts . . . and they shall no more teach one another, saying, Know Yahweh, for they shall all know Me from the least to the greatest," often regarded as post-exilic.

[2] On the general doctrine of Prophecy, etc., see the volume on the Pre-Exilic Prophets.

[3] P. 49. [4] Pp. 29 f. [5] Pp. 51 ff.

[6] נָבִיא.

ably all the members of this class were supposed to have a Divine calling and to be in some way or measure inspired; but for the most part the canonical prophets are in antagonism to the bulk of their professional brethren; Amos disclaims all connexion with them,[1] Jeremiah and Ezekiel denounce them.[2]

Ezekiel attacks "the prophets of Israel" that prophesy of themselves:[3] "They follow their own spirit," and not the Spirit of Yahweh, and "have seen nothing"; "They have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, Oracle of Yahweh![4] and Yahweh hath not sent them". They have "seen a vain vision" and "spoken a lying divination".[5] This professional class included women.[6] This description implies that the prophets as a class made the same claims as, for instance, Ezekiel; they asserted that they were moved by Divine inspiration, that they were led by the Spirit, that they saw visions of God, that they were sent by Yahweh, and that their statements were His oracles. These, therefore, are characteristics of the prophet as understood by Ezekiel. The reference to "divination," *qesem*,[7] is difficult. The wrong-doing of these prophets does not consist in their practising divination as such, but in the false, lying character of their divination; so that the term "divining" seems to describe

[1] Amos vii. 14. [2] Jer. v. 31; Ezek. xiii.

[3] E.V. "out of their own hearts"; but לֵב, "heart," is rather "mind".

[4] P. 18. [5] Ezek. xiii. 2, 3, 6, 7, xiv. 7-9.

[6] Ezek. xiii. 17; *cf*. Huldah, 2 Kings xxii. 14, and Noadiah, Neh. vi. 14.

[7] קֶסֶם.

a prophetic function. We may remember that Joseph "divined,"[1] and that Samuel was expected to discover the whereabouts of Saul's asses.[2]

A prophet may even be inspired by Yahweh to give a misleading answer to an unworthy inquirer.[3]

The attacks of Jeremiah and Ezekiel together with their own unworthy character and conduct discredited the prophetic class. They are ignored by Isaiah xl.-lxvi., which never use the term "prophet"; they appear as opponents of Nehemiah, and one of them took bribes from his enemies to mislead him by lying prophecies;[4] and at last the title "prophet" becomes synonymous with charlatan,[5] so that in the Greek period it was acknowledged that prophecy had ceased from Israel.[6]

The literature with which we are dealing is recognised as prophetic by its presence in the prophetic section of the Canon, and by the use of titles and formulæ, "the word of Yahweh came," "the burden of the word of Yahweh," "Oracle of Yahweh," etc., and possesses many characteristics of the records of the older prophecy. We may see further[7] how the doctrine of prophecy is illustrated by it.

The office is assumed in obedience to a Divine call. In Ezekiel i.-iii.[8] the prophet describes his call with great care and at some length; the date is given twice over according to two different ways of reckoning. "The

[1] A different word, however, נִחַשׁ, *nḥsh*, Gen. xliv. 5, 15.
[2] 1 Sam. ix. 6. [3] Ezek. xiv. 9.
[4] Neh. vi. 10-14. [5] Ps. lxxiv. 9.
[6] Zech. xiii. Perhaps too the watchmen and shepherds denounced in Zech. xi. and Isa. lvi. are prophets.
[7] *Cf.* p. 48. [8] *Cf.* p. 17.

word of Yahweh came unto him expressly,"[1] and the "hand of Yahweh was upon him"; a marvellous vision of the Divine Glory was vouchsafed to him; the Spirit entered into him; and Yahweh declared His intention of sending him as His messenger to Israel, and described His message and the reception.

We may compare in earlier times the calling of Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah; and we may conclude that such an experience was normal amongst the class, in spite of the silence of our records as to the call of less important prophets. The frequent use of the phrase "the word of Yahweh came" emphasises the constant dependence of the prophets on Divine Revelation; while somewhat differently "Oracle of Yahweh" asserts the claim to speak with Divine authority. Ezekiel, Haggai and Zechariah, and doubtless others of the later prophets, were, like their predecessors, essentially inspired preachers.[2] The account of the Servant of Yahweh must in a measure be based on the experiences of a faithful teacher and preacher.

Our literature is distinguished from earlier prophecies by the following characteristics. The original literary form was much oftener that of writing and not of speech. The older prophecies are the records of spoken addresses, sometimes, however, composed in metre, so that they might be accurately delivered and remembered. Not only were many sections of our books originally composed in writing; but the books are carefully compiled

[1] Ezek. i. 3. הָיוֹ הָיָה, *hāyô hāyâ*, an emphatic construction. Possibly, however, the *hayo* is due to accidental repetition, and we should omit the "expressly".

[2] P. 27.

and arranged, probably by the authors of their contents. There is a sequence and coherence in *Ezekiel*, *Isaiah* xl.-lv. and *Zechariah* i.-viii. which is in marked contrast to the confusion in *Hosea* and *Isaiah* i.-xxxix.

Our prophets are sometimes in conscious dependence upon their predecessors; Zechariah appeals to the authority of the ancient prophets.[1] Ezekiel and Zechariah make use of the symbolic vision far more freely than any of the pre-exilic prophets, even including Amos.

We may also note that Ezekiel, in this as in most else, following somewhat in the footsteps of Jeremiah, is conscious of a message to the individual Israelite.[2] Also the dignity of the prophet is marked by the fact that he receives the title Malakh Yahweh, "Messenger of Yahweh," or Malakhi, "My Messenger,"[3] borne by the superhuman ministers of God, who are sometimes thought of as manifestations of God Himself.

Priest.

In ancient times men consulted the priests as to the will of God. Ezekiel directs that the priests are to teach the people concerning things sacred and common, clean and unclean, and are to decide lawsuits "according to My judgments".[4] How the priests are to know these matters is not said. Haggai, at the bidding of Yahweh, consults the priests as to things holy and unclean.[5] In *Malachi*[6] it is said of Levi (the priestly tribe) that sound instruction[7] was in his mouth, and that he turned many away from iniquity.

[1] Zech. i.
[2] Pp. 31 f.
[3] Hag. i. 13; Mal. i. 1.
[4] Ezek. xliv. 23, 24; *cf.* vii. 26.
[5] Hag. ii. 11-13.
[6] Mal. ii. 1-9.
[7] תּוֹרַת אֱמֶת, *tôrath 'ĕmeth*, E.V. "law of truth".

"The priest's lips should observe knowledge, so that men should seek instruction at his mouth." The priest, like the prophet, is styled the *Malakh*, messenger or angel, of Yahweh Çebāôth. The special sin of the priesthood was that they had turned men aside from the way, and misled many as to their rights and duty[1] by giving partial judgments. Apparently the priest is the authority, the messenger of Yahweh, on questions of ritual and on matters of dispute between individuals; while the prophet declares the Divine will as to the nation, as to crises of the individual life, and as to general principles and conduct of life, especially in relation to God. Probably in practice the functions of the two classes often overlapped, and the ranks of the prophets were often recruited from the priestly families; Jeremiah, Ezekiel and probably Zechariah were priests. The "counsel of the elders" is also coupled with the "vision of the prophet" and the *Torah* of the priest".[2] This counsel also would be from Yahweh, and would represent the wisdom of *Job* and *Proverbs*.

Modes of Revelation.

In early times Yahweh could be inquired of "by dreams, by Urim," *i.e.*, the sacred lots operated by the priests, "or by prophets". Thus "Saul inquired of Yahweh, but Yahweh answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets".[3] Whereupon Saul obtained the required information by consulting a "woman with a familiar spirit," who called up the dead Samuel. The inquiring of Yahweh by Urim, or sacred lot, through the priests is

[1] E.V. "caused many to stumble in the law".
[2] Ezek. vii. 26. [3] 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, 7.

not mentioned in our books, and we gather from *Ezra* that this art had been lost before the Return. Certain families claimed to be priestly, but could not produce documentary evidence. They were forbidden to eat the most sacred things "till a priest should arise with Urim and Thummim".[1] On the other hand, in *Jonah*[2] the cause of the storm is ascertained by casting lots; and it seems strange that heathen sailors should enjoy a privilege denied to the priests of Yahweh. But this feature may be an archaism, merely part of the machinery of the allegory; or the author regarded it as an irregular practice which might be ventured on by individuals. Similarly[3] the King of Babylon uses divination[4] by arrows, teraphim, and the liver of a victim, and Yahweh uses this means to direct the king according to His own purposes. But this is merely a case in which God overrules for His own ends means which He does not prescribe or sanction. At any rate the prophets, the official representatives of Yahweh, do not speak of casting lots as a regular mode of ascertaining the Divine will for the Jews or their priests.

Turning to the other modes, Joel classifies them as prophecy, visions and dreams.[5] With regard to prophecy, it is clear that the prophets had an absolute conviction that they received communications from God. This conviction is so much a matter of course that they do not attempt to give the reasons for it, or to explain how they arrived at it. In something the same way a modern preacher or hymn-writer will declare the will of God or

[1] Ezra ii. 62 f.
[2] Jonah i. 7.
[3] Ezek. xxi. 21.
[4] *Qesem*; *cf.* p. 210.
[5] Joel ii. 28.

of Christ in words and ideas which are outside Scripture or at the utmost a private interpretation of inspired teaching, and would justify himself by referring to the inner light or the guidance of the Spirit. This is perhaps parallel to the statement of Ezekiel that the Spirit entered into him; the entrance of the Divine Spirit within him would be an inner experience. The numerous references to God speaking and the prophets hearing are consistent with this view; the psychology of the prophets did not distinguish between the sensation caused by a voice from without and the impression due to the operation of a spiritual influence on the soul. Indeed, the sentence we have just written could not be translated into Biblical Hebrew.

Nevertheless the use of certain terms recognises a difference between hearing men or thinking ordinary thoughts and receiving communications from God. "Coming of the Word of Yahweh" and "Oracle of Yahweh" are reserved for the latter.

"Oracle of Yahweh"[1] especially denotes the unique impression made by a Divine Revelation. Originally it may have referred to the peculiar tones in which an oracle was delivered by a priest or other agent or instrument, and it may have continued for a time to denote some physical concomitant to the spiritual experience of the prophets. But in our period it seems merely to denote the conviction that the speaker had received a Divine message. It does not tell us how the message came, except in so far as it implies a unique and exalted experience. Ezekiel's numerous phrases[2] show that he was

[1] נְאֻם יהוה, *Ne'um Yahwe*; see volume on Pre-Exilic Prophets.

[2] P. 202.

conscious of the remarkable nature of his call to be a prophet, and that he neither knew nor could devise any language that would adequately describe it. Note also his symbol that he received his revelation by eating a roll upon which the Divine message was written.[1]

Visions and dreams are also spoken of as modes of Revelation. We have numerous visions in *Ezekiel* and *Zechariah*, but our prophets do not provide any example of the inspired dream. We may accept the usual distinction that the dreamer sleeps and the man who sees visions is awake; but our own term "day-dream" illustrates the liability to confuse the two. Moreover, dreams belong to the transition state between full consciousness and perfect sleep, which would not readily be distinguished from the ecstatic condition in which men see visions. Zechariah saw visions at night,[2] and sometimes had to be wakened as if from sleep to behold them. While the most ordinary effect of the prophetic inspiration was to give the impression of receiving a message or hearing words, only the understanding or at most the sense of hearing being affected; in the case of a vision there was the further effect of a visual impression, often combined with hearing. In these visions angels[3] are often seen and heard as the messengers of Yahweh, acting in or interpreting the vision. The occasion of the visions was external to the prophet; but it is clear from their nature that the form was largely influenced by his memory and personality. The language in which it is described is also the prophet's own.

[1] P. 219. [2] Zech. i. 8, iv. 1.
[3] P. 168.

The messages with which the prophets were charged mainly concerned their own times; similarly the decisions or *Torah* of the priests dealt with the immediate difficulties of those who applied to them, and the counsel of the elders would also refer to present practical necessities. But the significance of Revelation was not exhausted by the reference to a single case or to one generation. Permanent principles were established and precedents were furnished. Thus Zechariah[1] appeals to the teaching of the earlier prophets; Ezekiel is largely influenced by Jeremiah; Joel reproduces many of the phrases and ideas of his predecessors; and all our prophets more or less maintain a continuous tradition. On these and other grounds we conclude that the utterances of the prophets were preserved in writing; that the works of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah had now been handed down for centuries; and that other prophetic compositions were committed to writing from time to time and preserved. The numerous notes and glosses which have been added to the text of the older prophets show that their works were constantly studied and were regarded with great reverence. But the exilic and post-exilic prophets do not appeal to the written records of earlier prophecy as an authority, a revelation; in other words, they do not treat them as canonical.

Canon.

We have seen[2] that one function of the priests was to instruct men as to questions of ritual and to decide controversies as to rights, duties, and privileges. This they were to do according to the *Torah* and the "judgments" of Yahweh. A *torah* is a decision or instruction on some

[1] Zech. i. [2] P. 76.

point of faith or conduct, and then the body of opinion or custom arising out of a series of such decisions. Finally the word came to be used for the written record of such decisions, for written codes. Such codes existed before the Exile, notably the legal portion of *Deuteronomy;* the *Law of Holiness* cannot be later than the close of the Exile; and doubtless the priests had preserved for their own guidance other notes as to ritual and legal procedure. But here again there is no express appeal to a book or written code, except in one or two doubtful cases, to which we shall refer later on. Ezekiel, for instance, publishes a code of his own which sometimes agrees with *Deuteronomy* and sometimes differs from it. The whole is given as a special revelation from God to the prophet. A study of the Pentateuch shows that the *Torah* was continually growing during our period; at any rate till about B.C. 400. We may conclude that until the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah the priests held themselves to be independent agents of Revelation; they would reverence custom and tradition, and would use writings for their own convenience. They were not controlled by a book as by a canonical authority; they themselves were the authorities as to the contents and interpretation of tradition.

There are two passages which are often supposed to make against this view. When Ezekiel was called to be a prophet, he received a roll written within and without with lamentations, mourning and woe. He was told to "eat this roll, and go speak unto the house of Israel". He ate it, and it was in his mouth as honey for sweetness.[1] This symbolic action may be based on Jeremiah's

[1] Ezek. ii. 8 - iii. 3.

saying,[1] "Thy words were found and I did eat them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart". This roll has been identified with *Deuteronomy*,[2] which contains terrible threats and curses, so that when Josiah read it, he rent his clothes,[3] and the passage has been understood as a declaration that Ezekiel is dependent on the teaching and authority of the earlier work. Considering the numerous parallels between Ezekiel and Jeremiah, it would be quite as reasonable to identify the roll with some collection of Jeremiah's prophecies. But the passage is a symbol of the communication of the words of Yahweh to the prophet; we can hardly imagine a mysterious hand from the glory of Yahweh presenting Ezekiel with a copy of *Deuteronomy*.[4]

Again, Malachi iv. 4 bids the people "remember the *Torah* of Moses, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, even statutes and judgments". The immediate reference is to the substance of the *Torah;* but the authority of Moses is now interposed between Yahweh and the priests. Elsewhere in *Malachi* the knowledge and teaching of the *Torah* belong to the priests, but it is not reasonable to interpret the verse, "Be careful to consult the priests as to the *Torah* and to follow their instructions". "Remember the *Torah*," addressed to the people generally, implies popular knowledge such as might be gained from a book; and ascribes canonical authority to *Deuteronomy* or some other written edition

[1] Jer. xv. 16. [2] Or the central portions of it.

[3] 2 Kings xxii.

[4] Stade, p. 292, holds that the roll had nothing to do with *Deuteronomy*, and compares the practice of swallowing writings containing magic spells.

of the Law of Moses. The verse seems hardly consistent with the prophet's previous references to the subject and may be a later addition.[1] However that may be, either in *Malachi* or somewhat later we find a written Law of Moses treated as a canonical authority. There is no evidence in the literature with which we are dealing that such a position was accorded to any of the historical or poetical books.

Scope.

The Old Testament assumes that God may be known by Man. Second Isaiah, the great apologist of the Jewish faith, is at much pains to prove that the God of Israel is the one true God, but he takes for granted both the existence of Yahweh and the possession by the Jews of a measure of knowledge concerning Him. Indeed, he expresses surprise at their comparative ignorance; they ought to have known more: "Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth?"[2] The course of events understood in the light of the teaching of the prophets is a continual revelation of God, hence the constant use, especially in Ezekiel,[3] of such phrases as "Then shall ye know that I am Yahweh". The prophets speak with unhesitating certainty as to the purpose of God for the world, Man and Israel in the past, present and future; and as to what He requires from Man. Such truths, however, are not part of the original equipment of human nature, but are made known by God through His inspired ministers.

The prophets deal with the circumstances of their own

[1] *Cf.* Mal. ii. 6-9. [2] Isa. xl. 21.

[3] Dillmann, p. 204; about fifty times, *e.g.*, vi. 7, 13.

times and are practical and positive, so that they have little to say as to the limits of Revelation, the imperfection of man's knowledge of God; such matters are discussed more fully in *Job*, *Ecclesiastes* and some of the Psalms. Yet there are references to the subject. Thus, "Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel"; "There is no searching of His understanding".[1] Second Isaiah's teaching almost amounts to a statement that God is infinitely greater than the world and Man; and Ezekiel's descriptions of the Glory of Yahweh reveal his profound conviction of the Divine transcendence. The teaching of the Old Testament on this subject is summed up in a contemporary document[2] thus, "the secret things belong to Yahweh our God: but the things that are revealed belong to us and to our children for ever, that we may observe all the ordinances[3] of this law".

Owing to their preoccupation with practical matters, the prophets are not perplexed by the difficulties arising out of the relation of the Unknown to the Known. God is great and wonderful beyond knowledge and expression; but they do not speculate about the infinite, unknown regions, so to speak, of God and the Universe; and they are not distressed by the possibility that in these regions there may be entities and forces which would vitiate their teaching.

We have called attention elsewhere[4] to the frank recognition of the limitations of prediction; both *Ezekiel* and *Jonah* record predictions and state that they were not fulfilled, without appearing to feel that the circumstance involves any difficulty.

[1] Isa. xlv. 15, xl. 28.
[2] Deut. xxix. 29.
[3] E.V. "do all the words".
[4] P. 127.

CHAPTER VI.

NATURE OF MAN.[1]

THE chief justification for the use of the term "psychology" is that it gives us another opportunity of emphasising the fact that our documents are not scientific treatises: they do not make exact statements as to the nature of man, or use words as strict, unvarying technical terms. Neither the science nor the technical terms existed in Israel even after the Exile to control the thoughts and language of the prophets. At the same time the expressions used by them imply certain current ideas which must be considered; but the various words are not always used in the same sense; and no term has an area of application exclusively reserved to itself; the terms overlap.

Psychology.

Some terms we need only mention. The seat of the emotions is the "reins".[2] "*Qerebh*," inward part,[3] is also used for the seat of moral and emotional qualities in a very general sense.

The terms with which we are chiefly concerned are

[1] For the relation of Man to God and the world, see above, pp. 185 ff.

[2] כְּלָיוֹת, kidneys. [3] קֶרֶב.

flesh, *bāsār* ;[1] spirit, *rûaḥ* ;[2] and *nephesh*.[3] The usage of the term "flesh" is on the whole clearly and obviously distinct from that of "spirit" and *nephesh* ; "flesh" covers an area of meaning mostly separate from that of the other two terms, and denotes the material, solid and fluid, portion of an animal organism. It is used of meat eaten as food, and is coupled with "blood".[4] "Flesh" is common to Man and animals, but is never used of God ; "all flesh" is equivalent either to "all mankind"[5] or "all living things".[6]

Flesh.

But neither flesh nor any of its synonyms play an important part in the ethics or theology of the Old Testament. Isaiah's "The Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit,"[7] is not ethical ; the contrast is between the power of God and of the spirit, *i.e.*, the active, prevailing life, and the helplessness of Man and of flesh. Flesh is chiefly the material substance of the body considered as inert and passive, sensitive but not active. Flesh in the Old Testament never has the technical sense of σάρξ in the Pauline theology. It is not in any special sense the sphere or the occasion or the opportunity for sin. It is not even human nature as incapable of response to the appeal of Revelation. On the contrary, when God wishes to make Israel loyal to Himself, He takes the stony heart out of their flesh, and gives them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in His statutes, and keep His ordinances and

[1] בָּשָׂר. [2] *Cf.* pp. 147, 201. [3] נֶפֶשׁ.

[4] Isa. xliv. 16, xlix. 26; Ezek. xi. 3.

[5] Isa. xlix. 26. [6] Ps. cxxxvi. 25.

[7] Isa. xxxi. 3.

do them, "and they shall be My people, and I will be their God".[1]

On the other hand, the ancient Israelites made their heart adamant that they might not hear the message of God by the prophets.[2] Our prophets say nothing about the origin of "flesh" except so far as it is included in the general statements as to the creation of all things by God.

It is probably true that the Old Testament recognises a dualism in Man; he is at once animal and a spiritual being who can have fellowship with God. However tempting it may be to identify "flesh," *nephesh*, and "spirit" with the Pauline σάρξ, ψυχή and πνεῦμα, such identification would be unjustifiable. There is no psychological trichotomy in the Old Testament; nor in our section of the literature any real dichotomy, only a certain dualism.

But this dualism only refers to two aspects of the same personality, and not to division into two parts, natures, or faculties; flesh, spirit, and *nephesh* are not obtained by a psychological analysis. "Properly speaking," as Davidson says, "Hebrew has no term for 'body,'"[3] and the Old Testament has no such phrase as "soul and body".[4] In the primitive account of the creation it is not said that Yahweh formed a *body*, but that He formed *man*, out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the

[1] Ezek. xi. 19 f. [2] Zech. vii. 11.

[3] *A.B.D.*, p. 188; גְּוִיָּה, *gewiyyá*, is rare and chiefly used for a corpse.

[4] The E.V. of Micah vi. 7, "the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul," is misleading; the word rendered "body" = here "sexual organ"; the clause might be rendered "my offspring for my sin".

breath of life; and man became a living creature.[1] But this primitive idea of man as a compound of dust and the Divine breath should hardly be exalted with Oehler[2] into a general Biblical doctrine that "The nature of man, like that of all animated beings, arose out of two elements —namely, from earthly material, and from the Divine Spirit". At any rate the doctrine is not taught in the later prophets.

Spirit.

Rûaḥ is not satisfactorily rendered by our "spirit," but we have nothing better; and on the whole the English word is sufficiently near to some of the leading senses of *rûaḥ* to justify its use. As the Spirit of God is the Divine life in action, and often the Divine life communicating itself to Man,[3] so the spirit of man is the active life, and is often thought of as bestowed on him by God.[4] When God regenerates His people, He gives them a new spirit; and when He raises Israel from the dead, He first brings the dry bones together and clothes them with sinews, flesh and skin, and then puts spirit into them.[5] The spirit of man does not indeed so far resemble the Spirit of God as to be active at a distance and communicate itself to others; but it is mobile and variable; it fluctuates and comes and goes. It fails and is revived;[6] it becomes dim;[7] it may be broken;[8] it becomes hot;[9] Yahweh stirs

[1] Gen. ii. 7. [2] Vol. i., 216. [3] *Cf.* pp. 201 ff.
[4] Pp. 175 f. [5] Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26, xxxvii. [6] Isa. lvii. 15 f.
[7] כֵּהָה, Isa. lxi. 3; *cf.* xlii. 3, 4, where the root is used where E.V. has "smoking" and "fail"; R.V. mg. "dimly burning," "burn dimly".
[8] Isa. lxv. 14, "breaking of spirit," E.V. "vexation of spirit"; *cf.* liv. 6, "grieved of spirit".
[9] Ezek. iii. 14.

up the spirits of men.[1] In an obscure passage[2] the possession of spirit seems to be spoken of as a special gift and privilege. With the spirit man seeks earnestly after God.[3]

Our texts do not clearly distinguish between the Divine Spirit communicating itself to men and the spirit of man, or between the temporary influx of, or possession by, the Spirit of God and the permanent spirit in man.[4] According to Davidson,[5] the vital principle in man "is called . . . 'the Spirit of God' because it is a power of God or a constant efficiency of His; and the 'spirit of man' because belonging to man". He illustrates this from *Job* and the Psalms. Our more theological writers do not commit themselves to this equation, but their language is influenced by a similar habit of thought. Thus the regeneration and resurrection of Israel is brought about through the bestowing of what is sometimes called "a new spirit" or "spirit," and sometimes "My Spirit".[6] Yahweh pours upon the people a spirit by which they may offer Him acceptable worship: "I will pour upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication".[7]

At the same time the spirit may act in opposition to God and lead men astray. Prophets deliver a false message through following their own spirit;[8] and men

[1] Hag. i. 14.

[2] Mal. ii. 15; but according to Nowack the present text is unintelligible; a slight correction gives the sense, "Do we not all owe our spirit to the same God?"

[3] Isa. xxvi. 9. [4] *Cf.* p. 226. [5] P. 195.

[6] Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f., xxxvii. 9, 14.

[7] Zech. xii. 10. [8] Ezek. xiii. 3.

need to watch their spirit lest it should lead them to deal treacherously.[1]

Ezekiel's Cherubim or "living creatures" possess "spirits,"[2] which is intimately connected with the Spirit, apparently the Spirit of God, and is diffused through the wheels.

Animals are not spoken of as having spirits in our books, or indeed as a rule in the Old Testament. "Spirit" does not occur, for instance, in Joel's description of the locusts. The parallelism between the spirit of man and the spirit of the beast in Ecclesiastes iii. 21 belongs to a late and non-prophetic development of language and thought.

Nephesh.

There is no English word which can be used with any comfort as an equivalent of *nephesh;* the usual rendering of the English versions, "soul," is mischievous and misleading. It makes it impossible for the ordinary student of the Bible to understand the teaching of the Old Testament, because it induces him to read into it whole masses of modern theology. *Nephesh*, like *Rûaḥ*, originally denoted an invisible cause of natural visible phenomena; as *rûaḥ* was wind, so *nephesh* was breath.[3]

In modern terms, both were attenuated material substances; and because they were invisible and mobile, they were thought of as the principles of life and force, or as we should put it, they were used for the psychical and spiritual. Probably "self" is the English word which

[1] Mal. ii. 15, 16. [2] Ezek. i. 20; *cf.* p. 117.

[3] *B.D.B.*, however, "supposed radical meaning *breath*," literally "that which breathes". Cheyne, *E.B.*, "properly 'breath,' but the sense seems to have gone out in Hebrew".

would most often express the meaning of *nephesh*. But the word is a perfect chameleon, and has an immense range of meaning. Putting aside its original concrete[1] sense of "breath," the nexus between the other uses is chiefly the underlying idea of the *nephesh* as "life" or "the vital principle". We are chiefly concerned with the word as used strictly in this sense, and in others directly derived from it; but we must notice less obvious uses. The abstract "life" is readily used for the concrete "living thing," and in the phrase "living *nephesh*"[2] the word equals "animal".[3] Curiously enough *nephesh* is so completely identified with the person and animal that even when dead they are called *nephesh*. Thus a person who has touched a corpse is said to be "unclean through a *nephesh*," E.V. "unclean by a dead body". In one passage[4] *nephesh* = "perfume".

Nephesh as the breath, life, or vital principle is occasionally used of something which a man possesses while he is alive, but which leaves him when he dies. Thus when the son of the widow of Zarephath died, "there was no breath[5] left in him," but Elijah prayed "let this boy's *nephesh* return upon his inward part, and Yahweh heard the voice of Elijah, and the boy's *nephesh* returned upon his inward part, and he became alive".[6] Usually, however, as in the case of animals, the *nephesh* is identified with the man to whom it belongs; but is man as conscious and living; it is, feels and does all that is pos-

[1] Not necessarily concrete to the Jews; *cf.* previous note.

[2] נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, *nephesh ḥayyâ*, Gen. i. 24.

[3] Hag. ii. 13.

[4] Isa. iii. 20.

[5] נְשָׁמָה, *neshāmâ*.

[6] 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff.

sible for man's intellect, emotions, moral nature and will.[1] Sensations are attributed to the *nephesh*, but acts are usually ascribed to the organs or limbs which perform them, hand, arm, etc. So the Servant of Yahweh makes his *nephesh* a guilt-offering and pours it out to death; and a man saves his *nephesh* by flight. The *nephesh* delights itself in fatness;[2] it is afflicted, and also satisfied with food and drink;[3] it rejoices in God, yearns after Him, belongs to Him, and yet can sin;[4] it pities.[5]

The use of *nephesh* for the will, character, or intellect is doubtful, and at any rate limited.[6] Ezekiel largely uses *nephesh* in connexion with the actual or possible loss of the life. Thus false prophets destroy the *nephesh*, and unrighteous princes shed blood and destroy the *nephesh;* and false prophetesses hunt for the *nephesh*. The E.V. "soul" is most misleading in such cases; the English "prophets destroy the soul" suggests corruption of character and faith; what is meant is that the prophet's advice leads to material ruin and death.[7] Similarly it is said that if Ezekiel warns the sinner in vain, he will nevertheless deliver his own *nephesh; i.e.*, he will be free from penalty of death to which he would have been liable if he had neglected his duty.[8]

When Ezekiel[9] describes the building up of a complete living man, the components he mentions are bones, sinews, flesh, skin and spirit; he says nothing about *nephesh*.

[1] But *cf.* below. [2] Isa. liii. 10, 12; Jer. li. 6; Isa. lv. 2.
[3] Isa. lviii. 10 f.; Ezek. iii. 19, xiii. 19 f.
[4] Isa. xxvi. 8, 9, lxi. 10; Ezek. xviii. 4; Micah vi. 7.
[5] Ezek. xxiv. 21. [6] *B.D.B.* [7] Ezek. xiii. 19 f.
[8] Ezek. iii. 19 f. [9] Ezek. xxxvii.

Often *nephesh* with a genitive is a mere personal pronoun; *e.g.*, my *nephesh* as subject is the emphatic *I*, and as direct or indirect object is "myself".

It is not easy to distinguish spirit and *nephesh;* they are often used as synonymous parallels; *e.g.*, "With my *nephesh* have I desired thee in the night, yea, with my spirit within me will I seek thee early". There are differences of usage; "spirit," for instance, never means an animal or a corpse.

On the other hand, *nephesh* is only used of God when it has lost its force as a noun and become a mere pronoun; thus in "My servant, whom I uphold; My chosen, in whom My *nephesh* delighteth,"[1] "I" and "My *nephesh*" are synonymous. We do not find the phrase "*nephesh* of God" or "of Yahweh".

Spirit and *nephesh* agree in that neither is commonly used of the life of the animal.[2] The animal is *nephesh*, but we do not find the phrase "*nephesh* of a horse," etc.

Nephesh is never used as "spirit" is of an efflux of Divine life entering into and possessing men; or of men's moods or disposition.[3]

According to Davidson, "any distinction of a substantial or elemental kind between רוּחַ [spirit] and נֶפֶשׁ [*nephesh*] is not to be understood. Neither is the רוּחַ [spirit] higher than the נֶפֶשׁ [*nephesh*], or more allied to God."[4] At the same time, "spirit" is more often spoken of in connexion with man's relation to God. Further, "the spirit of man and the soul[5] of man are not

[1] Isa. xlii. 1. [2] P. 228. [3] *A.B.D.*, p. 198.
[4] *A.B.D.*, p. 200. [5] *Nephesh.*

different things, but the same thing under different aspects. 'Spirit' connotes energy, power, especially vital power; and man's inner nature in such aspects as exhibiting power, energy, life of whatever kind, is spoken of as *spirit*. . . . The soul,[1] on the other hand, is the seat of the sensibilities. The idea of 'spirit' is more that of something objective and impersonal; that of 'soul' suggests what is reflexive and individual."[2] Cremer[3] agrees that "spirit" and *nephesh* are mostly synonymous; and considers that the differences of usage may be partly explained by regarding *nephesh* as the breath thought of as the condition of life, and "spirit" as the breath thought of as the manifestation of life.

There is probably much truth in the suggestion[4] that "spirit" and *nephesh* are independent developments, but in our literature both are well established.

An important part is played in Old Testament psychology[5] by the "heart".[6]

Heart.

The figurative usage of this term in Hebrew is quite different from ours; though the chief senses in each language are found as less common meanings in the other. With us the heart is the seat of the tender emotions and their opposites, especially love and hate. In Hebrew the heart is the seat of the mind, the moral nature, and the more self-regarding emotions, and the will. It is often coupled with the spirit; like the spirit it may be revived;[7] and regenerate Israel receives a new heart and a new spirit.[8] Like the "spirit" it

[1] *Nephesh.* [2] *A.B.D.*, p. 202.
[3] *Geist des Menschen, P.R.E.* [4] Stade, p. 180.
[5] *Cf.* p. 161, note. [6] לֵב, *lēbh.* [7] Isa. lvii. 15.
[8] Ezek. xviii. 31.

leads men astray and they go frowardly in the way of their heart. The heart melts where the spirit faints.[1] When a man gives serious and thoughtful attention to anything he "lays it upon [his] heart," an idiom similar to our "take it to heart".[2] When a man's heart is shut he cannot understand or consider; he has no knowledge.[3] The heart fears; enjoys prosperity and suffers in adversity.[4] The heart walks, *i.e.*, behaves as the heart of men's idols.[5] When things "come into the heart" men devise wicked schemes;[6] or they devise wicked schemes in the heart.[7] When men think they "say in their heart".[8]

In their heart men set up idols and are "taken" by Yahweh. The day of vengeance is in the heart of God, *i.e.*, is determined in His secret purpose.[9]

The heart of a self-willed, dissolute woman is "weak".[10] Ezekiel calls the foreign temple slaves "uncircumcised in heart and flesh," *i.e.*, unfit morally and physically for the service of the Temple.[11]

The heart is the seat of pride and self-sufficiency; it is the crowning sin of the Prince of Tyre that his heart is lifted up, and that he sets his heart as the heart of God,[12] *i.e.*, he is as confident in his power and wisdom as if he

[1] Isa. lvii. 17; Ezek. xiii. 2 f., xxi. 7. [2] Isa. xlii. 25.
[3] Isa. xliv. 18, 19. [4] Isa. lx. 5, lxv. 14.
[5] Ezek. xi. 21. [6] Ezek. xxxviii. 10, E.V. "mind".
[7] Zech. viii. 17. [8] Zech. xii. 5.
[9] Ezek. xiv. 7; Isa. lxiii. 4.
[10] Ezek. xvi. 30, so E.V.; Hebr. אֲמֻלָּה, *'āmulâ*. The text, however, may be corrupt; *cf.* Bertholet.
[11] Ezek. xliv. 7, 9.
[12] Ezek. xxviii. 2; Obad. 3, "the pride of thine heart".

were God Himself, or perhaps "a god," or "divine". It is the heart which should be torn with sorrow for sin, and turn to God in repentance; it should receive and retain the Divine Revelation.[1]

When Malachi[2] says that Elijah shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their father, he does not mean only that they shall be made mutually affectionate, but also that they shall be united in harmony and in a common purpose.

The Will.

Volitional acts, as we have seen, are ascribed to the *nephesh*, the spirit, and especially to the heart.[3] Ezekiel speaks of God giving over Israel to the *nephesh* of its enemies,[4] E.V. the "will" of its enemies, where, however, the reference may be rather to malice than to will. Will, in the sense of "that which is willed," is often denoted by *hēpheç*, E.V. "pleasure"; Cyrus is to perform "all my *hēpheç*," all that God purposes; men should not do their own *hēpheç*, *i.e.*, do just as they like, on the Sabbath.[5] The absence of exact terms for the will shows that the Jews of our period did not distinguish the will as a special organ or function of the personality. Neither were they conscious of the philosophical problem of the freedom of the will. At the same time the teaching of the prophets involves, though it does not state, the question of the relation of human freedom to Divine Sovereignty. As is usual in popular teaching, the two apparently contradictory aspects of religious truth are set forth and emphasised in separate

[1] Joel ii. 12 ff.; Zech. vii. 12.
[2] Mal. iv. 6; *cf.* Nowack.
[3] Pp. 232 ff.
[4] Ezek. xvi. 27.
[5] חֵפֶץ, Isa. xliv. 28, lviii. 13.

passages; but our prophets only rarely and tentatively touch upon the difficulties involved.

We are told that Yahweh created and chose Israel; and also that Israel was consistently wicked; but we are not told how this could be.[1] God's omnipotence is asserted[2] even over the moral and spiritual nature of man. Israel will be regenerate when God gives it a new heart and a new spirit.[3] The origin, revival, and purification of spiritual life in prophets and people is constantly attributed to God. But the question does not seem to suggest itself to the prophets: If Yahweh could regenerate Israel by giving them a new spirit, why did the people remain so long unregenerate? Why was not the new spirit given before? Very rarely, however, are any such ideas allowed to complicate the doctrine of moral responsibility. Men and nations are blamed for their acts; God is angry with them, and they are punished; and the prophets do not often consider whether Divine influence might not have prevented them from sinning and rendered punishment unnecessary. Thus they maintain that doctrine of responsibility which is usually understood to involve the freedom of the will. It need hardly be said that they neither know nor state the philosophical doctrine of the free will. As responsible, man has a moral nature; he is conscious of right and wrong, and of his obligation to do the one and avoid the other. But these truths, also, are not so much formally stated as implied in practical admonitions,[4] which would be meaningless if man were not able to choose between right or wrong; but how far the power to choose the

[1] P. 196. [2] *Cf.* p. 159. [3] Ezek. xxxvi. 26.
[4] *Cf.* below. See especially Ezek. xviii.

right depends on the Divine gift of a new spirit, and whether man may refuse that gift, we are not told.

Two problems arise out of our subject. First, could God have compelled men to be good, or are men able to sin in spite of God? If this question had been put formally to the author of Isaiah xl.-lv. when he was engaged in asserting God's supremacy, he would probably have answered that God could have done as He chose. At any rate such an answer would have seemed to be required by xl. and similar passages. On the other hand, he and other prophets constantly imply that man's wrong-doing is contrary to the will of God, and is contumacious disobedience. God spreads out His hands all the day unto a rebellious people—but apparently in vain; in ancient days Israel "rebelled and grieved His holy spirit; therefore He was turned to be their enemy, and Himself fought against them"; and Ezekiel's favourite phrase for Israel is a "rebellious house".[1] Rebellion arises in spite of the sovereign; a good king does not employ *agents provocateurs*. Nevertheless, in some passages human sins are attributed to a Divine influence.[2]

As far as any solution is suggested by our prophets, it would seem to be this. They are not occupied with the detailed, momentary working of the Divine Power; they do not think of omnipotence as asserting itself perfectly at every point of time and space. They are rather concerned with the whole scope and sequence of history. God's omnipotence does not consist in providing that nothing shall resist His will—the existence of

[1] Isa. lxv. 2, lxiii. 10; Ezek. ii. 5, and *passim*, בֵּית מְרִי, *bêth mĕrî*.

[2] Isa. lxiii. 17, lxiv. 7.

obstacles is taken for granted without inquiry as to their origin—but in overcoming all opposition and in ultimately making the world what He would have it, by annihilating His enemies and conforming the elect to His will. While this process is incomplete men may sin against God; He may even lead the sinner into deeper sin; but, in the end, men must either obey or perish.

The second question is: If God could have prevented sin, either by not creating bad men, or by not allowing them to become bad, why should they be punished? Here and there in the prophetic appeals to Yahweh on behalf of His people, this question is suggested. "But now, O Yahweh, Thou art our Father; we are the clay, and Thou our potter, and we all are the work of Thy hand."[1] As far as Israel is concerned—and as we have already said more than once it is in their teaching concerning Israel that the real doctrine of the prophets as to God and Man must be sought—as far as Israel is concerned, this question is partly answered by the statement that God having made or chosen Israel does not forsake His people on account of their sin, but for His name's sake perseveres in His education of them, and makes them a holy people.

But probably the attitude of the prophets towards such speculations would have been that of St. Paul, when he wrote: "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth He still find fault? For who withstandeth His will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"[2] The words in which the apostle continues are based upon

[1] Isa. lxiv. 8. [2] Rom. ix. 19.

Isaiah xlv. 9, 10, "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker, a potsherd among the potsherds of the earth! Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands? Woe unto him that saith unto a father, What begettest thou? or to a woman, With what travailest thou?"

It has been already pointed out that the teaching of the prophets is largely concerned with communities, especially with Israel. But a formal doctrine of the Community is as little to be looked for in their writings as a scientific psychology. "Israel," "Egypt," "Babylon" were known facts, taken for granted. Nevertheless there are prophetic ideas about communities which are important elements of Old Testament Theology. The antithesis of Church and State is even more foreign to the prophets than that between body and soul. We may take Israel as the typical community. All the concerns of Israel are religious, are part of its relation to God; its home, its crops, its commerce; its police or rather the maintenance of social order; its political status, as tributary, exiled, captive or free; its wars, alike in defeat and in victory, are all part of the Divine discipline. On the other hand, social equity is as much a part of the service of Israel to Yahweh as public worship. He requires righteous administration of justice, and generous treatment of the weak and helpless even more than sacrifices. Although, owing to special circumstances, Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets emphasise the duty of maintaining the Temple services, they also reiterate the ethical teaching of their predecessors.[1] Ezekiel not only provides for the restoration of

Community.

[1] P. 34.

the Temple and its ritual, but also allots new homes to the Twelve Tribes.

From one point of view the distinction between persons and things consecrated to Yahweh, *qadosh*, and those not so consecrated, implies a dualism like our sacred and profane; but the consecration existed on behalf of Israel. The King in ancient times was as much a part of the national religion as the priest; he was the Anointed of Yahweh, His servant and His gift to the nation. Ezekiel's Prince, *Nasi'*, has special duties and privileges in connexion with the Temple. Haggai and Zechariah are as much interested in Zerubbabel as in Joshua the High Priest.

When the Jews were ruled by Persian governors, the Temple and its worship became the chief manifestation of the national life; so that in Malachi, Joel, and in some measure in Zechariah ix.-xiv., the priesthood and the ritual are prominent; and we miss the complete, balanced, well-proportioned statements of the religious value of the community which we find in the earlier prophets.

On the other hand, our books contain passages which set forth that in the ideal nation, the true Israel, there will be no distinction between sacred and profane, the whole people, in all its possessions, experiences and activities will be sacred, "*qadosh*". Israel is to be called "the sacred people," "the priests of Yahweh . . . the ministers of our God";[1] the bells on the horses, the cooking-pots will be "sacred".[2]

Normally a people had three distinguishing notes: its descent traced in theory to a common ancestor, its land,

[1] Isa. lxii. 12, lxi. 6. [2] Zech. xiv. 20, 21.

and its God. Thus Israel is defined by the blood bond between its members symbolised by descent from Abraham and Sarah, Israel or Jacob; by its occupation of Canaan, and its worship of Yahweh. The people, however, is not absolutely limited to those of pure Israelite blood; the *gēr*, or resident alien, has a recognised status,[1] and is admitted to all the religious privileges of the Israelite; and some passages seem to contemplate the expansion of Israel by the absorption of masses of foreigners who turn to the worship of Yahweh.[2] On the other hand, St. Paul's principle, "they are not all Israel which are of Israel,"[3] is anticipated, and Ezekiel and his successors announce the formation of a righteous people by a judgment upon sinful Jews.[4]

In spite of the disappearance of the Ten Tribes in the Assyrian captivity they are still formally reckoned as part of Israel[5] in some passages; and probably this was the official view. But for the most part Israel stands for Judah and Jerusalem;[6] Isaiah xl.-lv. ignore the Northern Captivity, and Obadiah 19, 20, seems to distribute the territory of the Ten Tribes among the branches of Judah and Benjamin. The half-heathen population of Samaria was excluded from Israel.

The land of Israel in the last days of the monarchy had shrunk to Judah and almost to Jerusalem. The Captivity broke the physical links between the Jews and the last remnants of their territory.[7]

Through this separation Israel as a nation dies; the

[1] Isa. lvi. 6 f. [2] P. 188, and *cf.* below.
[3] Rom. ix. 6. [4] Pp. 19 f.
[5] Ezek. xlviii.; Zech. ix. 13, x. 7 ff.; Obad. 18.
[6] Zech. xii.; Mal. i. 1.
[7] *Cf.* p. 67 for an account of a somewhat different view.

Servant of Yahweh is cut off out of the land of the living;[1] Jerusalem is described as a wife slain for unfaithfulness; and all that is left of Israel is dry bones.[2] By the marvellous dealings of God the nation is raised from the dead; a long and glorious life is in store for the Servant of Yahweh; the slain Jerusalem shall be restored; the dry bones shall live. This resurrection is associated with, is indeed partly a symbol for, the restoration of the Jews to their own land.[3]

The close bond between land and people is shown by the fact that the Second Isaiah and Ezekiel frequently address themselves to Judah, Zion or Jerusalem. In our prophets Israel almost becomes a city-state. Nevertheless Ezekiel anticipates that Israel will again occupy the whole land west of Jordan.

Practically, however, Israel after the Exile was not confined to Jews dwelling in Palestine; there was a community at Babylon, and later on another at Alexandria, besides less important groups elsewhere. But for the most part the prophets decline to accept this situation; they regard it as temporary and abnormal; and eagerly look forward to the time when Israel shall be reunited in its own land.[4]

The outward expression of the relation between Israel and Yahweh in our period is the Temple and its services. The destruction of the former and the cessation of the latter are further symptoms of the death of the nation, and their restoration is part of its resurrection.

[1] Isa. liii. 8.
[2] Ezek. xvi. 40, xxiii. 47, xxxvii. 1 f.
[3] Isa. liii. 10 ff.; Ezek. xvi. 55, xxxvii. 14 ff.
[4] Joel iii. 1, 2; Zech. viii. 7, 8.

The fact that the teaching of the prophets refers largely to the nation must be constantly borne in mind in studying Old Testament Theology. Up to a certain point, indeed, principles are the same for a community and for an individual; but the application is often different. For instance, a nation may be purged of sin by the annihilation of sinners; but an individual who has committed murder is not cleansed from guilt by cutting off the arm with which he struck.[1]

For our prophets, therefore, as for their predecessors, the nation is a living organism with rights and duties as regards God and Man. Religion is not merely a matter between the individual and God; the individual approaches God as a member of a community; God is a shepherd, and as it has been well said, a shepherd cares for a flock not merely for a single sheep. A man's religious life, and for the Old Testament all life is religious, is bound up with the fortunes and experiences of his fellow-citizens. "The first virtue of a true Israelite is unconditional, reverential, and devoted love to the God to whom his people belongs. In the earlier days this devotion was rather conceived of as a resolute surrender of the whole personality to the God of Israel and to the national peculiarities, as zeal for Jehovah and His people and conscientious adherence to Israel's modes of life. The later ages, especially the post-Deuteronomic, regarded it as something much more inward."[2]

The view of man as a member of organic groups is not

[1] *Cf.* the article "Atonement" by J. D. F. Murray in *D.B.*; also pp. 306 f. of this work.

[2] Schultz, ii., 12.

confined to the Nation, but extends to the Tribe, the City, the Clan, and the Family. Probably in ancient times the original unit of society was the clan, a small group of families,[1] strongly conscious of the blood bond between them. Traces of the importance of the clan remain in our literature. The priestly house of Zadok and the families enumerated in Zechariah xii. 12 ff. were clans rather than families in our sense. Within the clan there was a common and continuous responsibility; the Zadokites of Ezekiel's time are to be rewarded for the loyalty of their clan in former days by a monopoly of the priesthood.[2] Ezekiel xviii. discusses the doctrine of the mutual responsibility of father and son.

The Family.

Yet as the community consists of individuals, there are also doctrines of the individual life.[3] God deals with the nation through individuals, kings, prophets, etc. But in our period the suspension of national life left only individuals to be dealt with; and Ezekiel and his successors are much more occupied than the earlier prophets with the individual; though still with special reference to the ancient Israel which had determined his past and the coming Israel which involved his hopes for the future. The idea of a new righteous Israel as the result of the cutting off of sinners raised many questions as to the individual. Such a purification was not a process applied to the whole nation; it required an examination of the spiritual condition of each individual, and an exposition of God's

Individualism.

[1] The phrase "group of families" would not be accurate before the establishment of marriage with a single husband.

[2] Ezek. xliv. 15 f. [3] Pp. 31 ff.

principles of punishment and forgiveness, and of His methods of discipline for the individual. When the new Israel was in a measure constituted by the Restoration, it was not perfectly righteous and never became so; its entire purification remained an ideal for the future. But the teaching of Ezekiel determined that of his successors; the cleansing was not looked for as a result of a Divine operation on the nation as a whole, but through the work of grace, as we should say, on some individuals, and the destruction or exclusion of others.[1]

But this division into two classes was not only regarded as belonging to a future judgment, but was recognised as a feature of the existing community; so that the application of revealed truth to the individual became an important part of religious teaching.

[1] Zech. v. 1-4.

CHAPTER VII.

THE NORMAL RELIGIOUS LIFE.

In our literature the existing conditions of the religious life were always regarded as temporary and provisional. Certain necessary elements were always wanting—during the Exile Israel was without land or Temple; after the Return the people were still scattered throughout many lands; and for a long while the Temple services were not properly organised. Even after the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews were still a divided, subject race; and the community at Jerusalem was seldom, if ever, united in obedience to the teaching of the Pentateuch and the later prophets. The Maccabean régime failed to satisfy the enthusiastic supporters of Judaism. A long and sad experience may incline us to regard such an unsatisfactory state of things as normal; but it was not accepted as such by our prophets, who rather looked for the normal religious life in an ideal future.

The pre-exilic prophets had already repudiated the popular religious system of their day; but in the period before the canonical prophets there were times when Israel and Yahweh, as men felt, were mutually satisfied with each other. The wide prevalence of such a view is

shown by the vehemence with which it is attacked by the prophets.

Our prophets, however, did not despair of the restoration of normal, satisfactory relations between Yahweh and Israel; the elementary stage which Revelation had reached prevented them from relegating this restoration to a future life in another world; they were not contented with the devotion of individuals to God. Hence they looked for the establishment of a normal religious life of the nation in the near future.

The normal conditions of the religious life as set forth by the prophets may be described briefly as follows. Israel would be united in Canaan as an independent state under the restored Davidic dynasty.[1] Jews in a foreign land or under heathen rule could not adequately fulfil their religious duties; and on the other hand, foreign dominion was an indication that Israel had not entirely recovered the favour of Yahweh. The worship of Yahweh would be carried on in the Temple at Jerusalem, by the legitimate priesthood, according to the legitimate ritual.

The Temple.

Our prophets take for granted the limitation of sacrifice to the Temple at Jerusalem, thus following *Deuteronomy* and the "Law of Holiness". As there could be no adequate public worship of Yahweh without sacrifice, the Temple became the one sanctuary; and all our prophets display the keenest interest in the Temple. With the doubtful exception[2] of

[1] Pp. 351 f.; *cf.* below.

[2] P. 108. Unless Isa. xix. 19, "In that day shall there be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt," belongs to the Greek period, and refers to the Temple of Onias.

Isaiah lxvi. 1, the possibility of a multiplicity of sanctuaries never occurs to them. Cyrus is raised up to build the Temple. To Ezekiel the architecture of the Temple is matter of Divine Revelation. Of the nine chapters occupied with his picture of the New Israel, we may reckon roughly that four are devoted to the Temple, one to the priesthood, one to the ritual, one and a half to the division of the land, and the rest to other matters. For Ezekiel the Temple embodied principles of the communion of God with His people. These may be summarised with Dr. Skinner[1] as "separation, gradation and symmetry". As we have seen,[2] the divinity of Yahweh required that the agents and instruments of fellowship with Him should be "sacred," separated from common use, or to put it in a somewhat modern way, guarded against association with anything physically or morally objectionable or unworthy. This end is attained in the Temple by a system of gradation; to begin with, the whole land is sacred, then a large central district is reserved as an "oblation"[3] for Yahweh, a sacred portion to be occupied by the Temple and the priesthood, then there was the Temple area, outer and inner courts, then the sanctuary with porch, outer and inner chambers. The inner chamber is described as "most sacred".[4] "It is to be observed that while Ezekiel being a priest enters the holy place along with the guide, he refrains from entering the most holy place, which the angel alone enters."[5]

[1] P. 413. [2] P. 161. [3] תְּרוּמָה, *terûmâ*, Ezek. xlv. 1.

[4] Ezek. xli. 4, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, "Holy of Holies"; but *cf.* xliii. 12.

[5] *A.B.D.*, *C.B.S.*, on Ezek. xli. 1-4.

The sanctity or separation provided for the new Temple is contrasted with the ancient arrangement by which the royal palace stood in the same enclosure as the Temple, and the royal tombs in the immediate neighbourhood; any such profane proximity is strictly forbidden for the future.[1] The importance of the Temple is further emphasised by the insistence of Haggai and Zechariah on the duty of rebuilding it, and their predictions of its future wealth and splendour.[2]

Priests.

The same idea of graded sanctity is found as to sacred persons; to begin with, the whole nation is sacred; but out of the nation a special class are set apart for the duties of public worship. *Deuteronomy* had already limited the priesthood to Levites; but Ezekiel proposes to divide them into two grades; the Levites or priests of the old high places are degraded to menial servants of the sanctuary on account of the abuses of the shrines at which they ministered; they are to take the place of the foreign temple slaves of the monarchy. The priesthood proper is reserved for the house of Zadok, the Jerusalem priesthood.[3] We do not know whether Ezekiel's proposals were adopted exactly in this form. The distinction between priests and Levites does not seem to have been formally recognised for some time after the Return; we shall read of the priesthood as the "Levitical priests"[4] or "Levi," or "the house of Levi";[5] we know from the Pentateuch and the Psalter that the division into priests and Levites was ultimately established, but

[1] Ezek. xliii. 7-9. [2] Pp. 65 ff. [3] Ezek. xliv.

[4] Isa. lxvi. 21; so Duhm and Marti by a slight correction of the text; R.V. "for priests and Levites," lit. "for priests, for Levites".

[5] Mal. ii. 4; Zech. xii. 13.

the priests are then called the house of Aaron, not the house of Zadok.

In *Zechariah* we find a formal recognition of the special status of the head of the priesthood, afterwards known as the High Priest.[1] In *Haggai*, *Joel* and *Malachi* the priests appear as an important class of the community.

The sanctity of the priesthood is at once expressed, symbolised and guarded by special regulations as to food, clothing and other material matters. When they officiate they must wear linen not wool, because wool causes sweat; they must neither shave their heads nor suffer their hair to grow long,[2] in contrast probably to ancient superstitious practices.[3] They must not take wine when on duty; they must not marry a widow or a divorced woman; and they must not eat the flesh of an animal that has died a natural death or been mangled. The priest Joshua is clothed in a turban and rich apparel.[4]

In this connexion an interesting point emerges, "sanctity" is contagious and harmful. The priests may only wear their sacred garments within the Temple; when they mingle with other classes they must put on ordinary clothes, lest they should sanctify the people with the garments.[5] Apparently if a man were touched by a sacred garment, he or more probably his garments became sacred, and could no longer be used for ordinary purposes, but must be destroyed or devoted to the service of Yahweh. Similarly, "At Mecca, in the times of heathenism, the sacred circuit of the Caaba was made . . . either naked" or in borrowed clothes; if a man made the

[1] P. 75. [2] Ezek. xliv. 18 f. [3] Smend, p. 153.
[4] Ezek. xliv. 20-31; Zech. iii. 4 f. [5] Ezek. xliv. 19.

circuit in his own clothes, he could neither wear them again nor sell them, but had to leave them at the gate of the sanctuary. They became taboo through contact with the holy place and function.[1] Elsewhere[2] we have a limitation of this contagion of sanctity. If a man is carrying sacred flesh in the skirt of his garment, and touches anything with the skirt, it does not become sacred; though we should probably understand that the skirt is sacred.[3]

Ritual.

The due relation and loyalty of Israel to Yahweh were expressed and maintained by daily sacrifices,[4] and by special offerings on the feasts, new moons, and Sabbaths.[5] These offerings included sin-offerings for the cleansing of the Temple and the people.[6] Ezekiel assigns to the Prince the duty of providing the material for the various public offerings. Individuals also made sacrifices on their own account. The interruption of the daily sacrifices is a disaster; and the presentation of unsatisfactory offerings a heinous offence.[7] Fasts and feasts were also observed.[8]

The stress laid on the services of a single sanctuary is explained by two considerations. First, the community was settled in and about a comparatively small town, so that every one might be present at the services, at any

[1] *R.S.*, p. 451, where other examples are given; *cf.* Lev. vi. 27 f., xvi. 26, 28; Isa. lxv. 5.

[2] Hag. ii. 12.

[3] *Cf.* below.

[4] Ezek. xliii. 27, xliv. 27, xlvi. 13 ff. For some details as to the sacrifices, *cf.* below, pp. 313 f., and for a full treatment of the subject, see the volume on the Pentateuch.

[5] Ezek. xlv. 17.

[6] Ezek. xlv. 18 ff.

[7] Joel i. 13; Mal. i. 6 ff.

[8] Zech. viii.

rate occasionally. Secondly, the worship was offered on behalf of Israel; the Temple represented the land, the priesthood the people, the sacrifices their possessions.

We have seen [1] that there are more or less certain traces of more liberal views, of an ideal future when Yahweh will be so immediately present with His people as to need neither Temple, priests nor prophets. Elsewhere the priesthood is extended beyond the Jerusalem priests to the whole people, perhaps even to the Gentiles.

Right relations between God and His people demanded not only the maintenance of a legitimate public worship, but also righteousness and "cleanness". The two latter conditions were not distinguished by the Jews; the righteous man would be careful to observe the rules as to "cleanness". We will discuss the prophetic teaching as to righteousness later, but "cleanness" may be dealt with here.

Clean and Unclean.

The ideas of "clean" [2] and "unclean" [3] are closely akin to those of "sacred" and "common".[4] They all arise out of the belief that certain physical conditions are essential to intercourse between God and Man. The positive conditions are involved in the necessity of associating that intercourse with special places, persons, etc., known as "sacred"; the negative conditions require the avoidance of that which would hinder intercourse, namely, that which is "unclean". Everything physical incompatible with the worship of Yahweh is "unclean";

[1] Pp. 112, 120.

[2] טָהוֹר, *ṭāhôr*.

[3] טָמֵא, *tāmē'*.

[4] חֹל, *ḥōl*.

and the man who is "clean" is capable of taking part in worship.[1]

The idea of uncleanness arose in primitive times, and the Jews of the Exile and the Return received the rules as to clean and unclean from ancient tradition; they were positive laws which did not need to be justified or explained. Naturally the priest Ezekiel is the one of our prophets most interested in this subject. One of the duties of the priests is to teach the difference between the sacred and the common, the clean and the unclean; and we have a practical example in *Haggai*.[2] When Israel is regenerated, Yahweh promises, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean, and I will cleanse you from all your uncleannesses and from all your idols".[3] The captivity was Yahweh's punishment of Israel for its transgression and uncleanness. The corpses of the slain heathen invaders pollute the land, which is cleansed by their removal.[4] In the ideal future the unclean spirit will be driven out of the land.[5]

Although uncleanness was essentially physical, yet it was not altogether without moral or spiritual significance. The rules were often seemly and wholesome; and their observance was associated with obedience to and worship of Yahweh. Thus what was foreign was unclean. The Second Isaiah promises that the uncircumcised and the unclean shall not enter Jerusalem; and in urging the Jews to flee from Babylon, he bids them not to touch any unclean thing.[6] Uncleanness is even more contagious than sanctity.[7]

[1] Stade, p. 137.
[2] Ezek. xxii. 26, xliv. 23; Hag. ii. 13 ff.
[3] Ezek. xxxvi. 25.
[4] Ezek. xxxix. 12, 24.
[5] Zech. xiii. 2.
[6] Isa. lii. 1-11.
[7] Hag. ii. 13 f.

The pictures of the New Israel of the future do not always represent the people as absolutely free from sin. The sinner may still be present; Ezekiel provides for daily sin-offerings, and for two special days of Atonement.[1] There are other indications that the prophets did not think right relations between Israel and Yahweh involved the absolute sinless perfection of every Israelite. A certain measure of minor wrongdoing was to be expected, and would not disturb the good understanding between Yahweh and His people if the culprits repented and made atonement by sacrifice. Mistakes and accidents might lead to ritual offences, and the indulgence granted to such was naturally extended to other venial sins.

Sin.

So far we have been considering the community; but in doing so we have to some extent dealt with the religious life of individuals, upon whom necessarily the righteousness and "cleanness" of the land and the nation depended. On the other hand, the religious life of the individual depended on his being a member of the Chosen People, loyal to Israel and to its God.[2]

Religious observances belonging alike to the nation and the individual were the keeping of the Sabbath, offering sacrifices, praise and prayer.[3] 'On new moons and Sabbaths all flesh are to worship before Yahweh.[4] The payment of tithes and the presentation of offerings are also required.[5]

Prayer is referred to as a familiar feature of the religious

[1] Isa. lxv. 20; Ezek. xliii. 25, xlv. 18, 25. [2] *Cf.* p. 197.

[3] Isa. lvi. 2, 6, lviii. 13, lxvi. 23; Jon. ii. 1, iv. 2; Zech. vii. 2, viii. 21, 22.

[4] Isa. lxvi. 23. [5] Mal. iii. 7-12.

life both of Jews and Gentiles; the latter pray to their gods or idols.[1] In *Jonah* the heathen sailors cry "every man unto his god," and exhort the prophet to call upon *his* God.[2] Sinners "cover the altar of Yahweh with tears, weeping, and sighing, because He regardeth not the offering any more, neither receiveth it with good will at your hand".[3] Men come to the Temple to entreat the favour of Yahweh.[4] Ezekiel's writings are largely a record of his prayerful fellowship with God. Prayer would constantly be associated with sacrifice to set forth its purpose. But in many of the instances cited prayer is offered without sacrifice. God Himself prompts true prayer, sending a "spirit of grace and supplication".[5] It is clearly implied that prayer is a request for some boon, which the worshipper hopes may be granted. Sometimes the request is granted, sometimes not. "Jonah prayed unto Yahweh his God out of the fish's belly . . . and Yahweh spake unto the fish, and it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land"; but Jonah also prays Yahweh to take away his life, and the request is not granted.[6] Answers to prayer depend upon the spirit of the worshipper and the nature of the petition. Sin, especially the neglect to care for the Temple and its services, often makes prayer of no avail.

Prayer.

But many passages, notably the Prayer of Jonah and Isaiah lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12, show that prayer was not merely a string of petitions, but included confession, penitence, and thanksgiving; and was the full expression of the fellowship of the devout soul with God.

[1] Isa. xliv. 17, xlv. 20.
[2] Jonah i. 5, 6.
[3] Mal. ii. 13.
[4] Zech. vii. 2.
[5] Zech. xii. 10.
[6] Jonah ii. 1, 10, iv. 2 f.

The duty of prayer is insisted on in phrases like "Seek ye Yahweh while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near".[1] Such passages, however, are not common; it is taken for granted that men would be forward in asking favours of their God.

There is considerable evidence, mostly indirect, of the study of religious truth, partly through religious literature.[2] This may have been chiefly confined to a limited class; but the appeals to the facts of history and to the messages of the older prophets imply widespread general knowledge of these subjects; so that some study of them must have been part of the training of the ordinary Jew. The public preaching of the prophets taught the people the religious interpretation of history, and the application of the fundamental principles of Jewish religion to the circumstances of the times. But the inspired prophets only appeared at special crises, and the ordinary professional prophet seems to have been rather a soothsayer than a religious teacher; and throughout our period the activity and importance of the prophets continually declined until it disappeared.[3] Ezekiel, indeed, seems at one time to have preached constantly with much acceptance and little result;[4] but we cannot look upon the later prophets as providing the people with periodical religious instruction in the form of preaching; nor do they refer to any such practice on the part of others. The teaching given by the priests consisted of information on points of ritual and civil law.

Teaching.

[1] Isa. lv. 6. [2] P. 116.
[3] P. 125. [4] P. 27.

The prophetic admonitions do not expressly urge the duties of the study of religious truth, nor yet of preaching or the attendance at preaching. But we must not lay much stress on these omissions ; the prophets were chiefly occupied with the nation, and did not compose manuals for the religious life of the individual. Moreover, the literature after the Return is brief and fragmentary.

CHAPTER VIII.

RIGHTEOUSNESS AND SIN.

We merely mentioned "righteousness" on the part of the people as one of the conditions of right relations between Yahweh and Israel; and reserved this subject for separate treatment. In Judaism, as in all religions, certain things in connexion with the community and its members are pleasing to the Deity, and others unpleasing. Both classes include acts, words, thoughts, states of body and mind. The Deity requires that His people should do and be what He approves, and should avoid what He disapproves. For the purposes of this discussion we may use English words—"righteousness," for the doing and being of what God approves, and the avoiding of what He disapproves; and "sin," for the doing and being of what God disapproves, and the neglecting of what He requires.

We may illustrate from our literature the use of some Hebrew terms. Apart from words denoting particular vices and virtues, Hebrew has a number of general terms for righteousness and sin, which may often be grouped in couples of contrasts. "Good" and "evil"[1] are perfectly general, including material non-

Terms.

[1] P. 176.

moral qualities. Yahweh condemns evil as a quality of human character and conduct, and men are exhorted to turn from their evil ways;[1] but He Himself sends evil or misfortune on the wicked.[2] Terms almost as wide, except that they are confined to that which is offensive to God, are the group of cognates, *ḥēṭ'*, *ḥaṭṭ'āth*, *ḥătā-'â*, *ḥaṭṭā'â*,[3] usually translated "sin," a word to which they correspond in usage. Men's sins hide the face of God from them; He is wrath when they sin.[4] Sin is contrasted with righteousness,[5] *Çedeq*, *Çedāqâ*;[6] "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people".[7] *Çedeq* and its cognates had a forensic use;[8] the man who had the law on his side was *çaddiq*, "righteous," and this forensic use controls the application of this group of words to other matters. Thus, Skinner: "The most prominent aspect of the notion is the *forensic*, although this by no means excludes an ethical and religious reference . . . questions of right and wrong were habitually regarded from a legal point of view as matters to be settled by a judge . . . and this point of view is emphasised in the words derived from צדק. This, indeed, is characteristic of the Hebrew conception of righteousness in all its developments." The reference in the opening lines of the quotation is to

[1] Ezek. xxxiii. 11 [2] P. 156.

[3] חַטָּאת חַטָּאָה, חַטָּאָה, חֵטְא.

[4] Isa. lix. 2, lxiv. 5. [5] Ezek. iii. 20, xviii. 4, 5, 14, 24.

[6] צְדָקָה, צֶדֶק. For a careful discussion of these words, see Skinner, Art. "Righteousness," *D.B.*

[7] Prov. xiv. 34. [8] *Cf.* p. 148.

earlier Israel; but as the last sentence states, the forensic sense influenced the usage throughout the literature. Moreover, the forensic sense itself continued throughout.

As a forensic term *çedeq* and its cognates are opposed to *resha'*,[1] E.V. "wickedness," and its cognates. *Rāshā'*, "wicked," is used of the man who is legally in the wrong, guilty.

The corrupt judge "justifies the wicked for a reward,"[2] *i.e.*, "declares the guilty, *rasha'*, to be in the right, *çaddiq*". *Rasha'* and *resha'* are also the opposite of *çaddiq* and *çedeq* in their wider uses; thus in Ezekiel xviii. the man who is contrasted with the righteous man is "wicked"; in verse 20, "the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him". Hereafter God's people shall be able to "discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not".[3]

The fact that *çedeq*, etc., are opposed both to *ḥet'*, etc., and *rasha'*, etc., suggests a close connexion between the two latter groups. Speaking generally, we might say that these two supplement each other in providing words to express "sin," "sinner," etc. *Hēt'*, etc., provide the nouns for "sin" and the verb "to sin"; *rasha'* is used as the noun "wicked man," "sinner," and the adjective "wicked," "sinful". "Sinner" and "sinful" cognate with *hēt'*, and "sin," noun and verb, cognate with *rasha'*, are used, but much less frequently.

In opposition to righteousness and parallel to sin we

[1] רֶשַׁע. [2] Isa. v. 23. [3] Mal. iii. 18.

also have *'āwôn*,[1] E.V. "iniquity"; *pesha'*,[2] E.V. "transgression"; *'āwel*, "iniquity,"[3] and its cognates, besides other less common words. Of those just cited *pesha'* and its cognate verb occur most frequently; the others are far less common than the members of the *het'*, *çedeq*, *rasha'* groups. *Pesha'* too has the most distinctive meaning; the verb is also used in the secular sense of "rebel," so that *pesha'*, "transgression," and its verb "transgress" would suggest that sin is rebellion against God.

"Upright," *yashar*,[4] and "perfect," *tāmim*,[5] are also used to describe the character of the righteous man:[6] "The way of the righteous is uprightness:[7] thou that art upright dost direct the path of the righteous".

Two opposed words, less general, but still covering a wide range are *ḥesedh*, "loving-kindness,"[8] and *ḥāmās*,[9] E.V. "violence". The former covers most virtues between man and man, the latter includes many forms of active wrongdoing. The Servant of Yahweh "did no violence".[10] The celebrated passage in *Micah*, which is perhaps exilic, sums up the requirements of God thus, "to do justice, and to love *ḥesedh*, and to walk humbly, with thy God".[11] "Men of *ḥesedh*" is used as a synonym of "righteous".[12] *Ḥesedh*, however, is rare in our books and is mostly used of God; and the adjective *ḥāsîdh* does not occur.[13]

[1] עָוֹן, Ezek. xviii. 20. [2] פֶּשַׁע, Ezek. xviii. 22.

[3] עָוֶל, Ezek. xviii. 24; specially common in Ezekiel.

[4] יָשָׁר. [5] תָּמִים. [6] Isa. xxvi. 7.

[7] מֵישָׁרִים, *mêshārîm*. [8] P. 151. [9] חָמָס.

[10] Isa. liii. 9. [11] Mic. vi. 8. [12] Isa. lvii. 1.

[13] Unless Mic. vii. 2 belongs to our period.

The identification of wisdom or knowledge with righteousness and of folly with sin, which is found elsewhere, especially in the Wisdom literature, is not prominent in the books we are studying; though we find a trace of it in Ezekiel's description of the false prophets as "foolish".[1] Again, Yahweh has no compassion on Israel, because it is "a people of no understanding".[2]

The ritual terms "sacred" and "common,"[3] "clean" and "unclean,"[4] are rarely used of men or of Israel in the prophets.[5] Sometimes "sacred" and "clean" are simply ritual, "dedicated to" and "fit for the service of Yahweh"; but in other passages they seem also to imply a moral and spiritual fitness for fellowship with God.

In discussing the general terms we have not always referred to the etymology. In the case of *hēṭ'*, "sin," and its cognates, it is true that the root occurs occasionally in the sense of "miss the mark" or "the way"; but the occurrences are very few compared to those in which it has some meaning connected with sin. In this period the ideas suggested by "sin" were probably not influenced by its etymology. Similarly *'āwel*, *'āwōn*, "iniquity," may not have owed much of their force to their root meaning of "twisted," "crooked". The dominant words in this connexion are *ṣedeq* and its cognates. The group of words cognate with "righteousness," "wickedness," "rebellion," imply that righteousness is that which conforms to standards laid down and enforced

Nature.

[1] *Nabal*, Ezek. xiii. 3. [2] בִּינוֹת, *bînôth*, Isa. xxvii. 11.
[3] *Qadosh*, "holy," and *ḥōl*; *cf.* p. 31, and Ezek. xxxvi. 25.
[4] *Ṭahor* and *Tame'*; *cf.* pp. 251 f. and Isa. lxii. 12.
[5] *Qadosh* is used of things and often of Yahweh.

in earthly courts of justice, and also by God as Judge and King. Sin is that which is condemned by human and Divine justice. The etymology and the usage of most of the other relevant terms express various forms of the same idea; righteousness is straight, upright; sin is twisted, crooked, and misses the mark.

The use of the same terms "good" and "evil"[1] for moral and material qualities, implies the close connexion between sin and suffering, the unprofitableness, the harmfulness of sin; an aspect specially emphasised in the term "violence".[2]

The frequent use of these various terms by our prophets shows that they were occupied with the objective side of sin, the external wrongful act. We shall see later that they do not ignore sins of motive and feeling, but their constant preoccupation with the life of the nation and with the practical needs of the people concentrated their attention upon action. The more subjective terms, "loving-kindness," etc,[3] are more frequent in the devotional poems of the Psalter.

Ezekiel uses a term, *'awel*, "iniquity," which is only found with one or two doubtful exceptions in exilic and post-exilic literature. The usage may be a symptom of a greater and more special sensitiveness as to sin, but the occurrences are not numerous enough to enable us to differentiate the word from its synonyms.

We may now turn to the more practical indications of the nature of righteousness and sin in the statements as to the acts, feelings, and qualities which God approves or disapproves. Pictures are drawn for us of the

[1] *Tōbh, Ra'*, p. 257. [2] *Ḥamās*.
[3] *Ḥesedh, Ḥāsîdh*, p. 260.

righteous man and the sinner in Ezekiel xviii.[1] From this we learn that righteousness consists positively in feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, restoring the pledge to the debtor, and giving just judgment—*i.e.*, beneficence and justice; and negatively in avoiding the following practices, eating upon the mountains, worship of idols, adultery, intercourse with a woman during her "separation," robbery, and usury—*i.e.*, illegitimate forms of worship, crimes against property and against family life, and breaches of social decorum. Ezekiel does not include positive religious duties, sacrifice, etc., amongst the forms of righteousness; probably because he is here thinking of the individual, and worship was specially the concern of the community, and also because worship of some sort was a matter of course.

These lists may be illustrated and amplified from other passages; but the principles involved are for the most part the same. In the sphere of ritual, worship, etc., sorcery[2] and other superstitions are condemned. The practices objected to are disapproved of, partly because they are cruel and immoral, partly because they are offered to "strange gods". The transgressors "slay the children in the valleys," exhaust their energies and their substance in futile rites.[3] They perform their ceremonies among the graves, eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels; they prepare a table for Fortune and mix libations for Destiny.[4]

Special classes have their special duties and sins. Prophets and priests are condemned for neglecting their ministry; for misleading the people by speaking accord-

[1] *Cf.* also Isa. lviii., Zech. vii. [2] Mal. iii. 5.
[3] Isa. lvii. [4] Isa. lxv. 5, 11, lxvi. 17; *cf.* Ezek. viii.

ing to their own prejudices and not by Divine inspiration; for misusing their gifts and authority for private profit.[1] At last prophecy itself becomes a mere imposture.[2]

In the sphere of social life, the following are also condemned—taking undue advantage of the weak and helpless, the widow, the orphan, the resident alien, together with paying low wages to the hireling;[3] unfilial behaviour to father and mother;[4] unjustifiable divorce;[5] quarrelsomeness;[6] cruelty;[7] falsehood and perjury;[8] theft;[9] and murder.[10] Princes, especially, are warned against using their authority harshly and oppressively.[11]

The most important additions to Ezekiel's lists are, first, the duty of providing tithes and offerings, especially unblemished victims; of providing a sanctuary for the worship of Yahweh; and of attending festivals and observing the Sabbath.[12] And again we have in various places a recognition of good and bad qualities of character as well as conduct. God dwells with him who is of a contrite and humble spirit; on the other hand, the Prince of Tyre is condemned for his pride.[13] In the Day of Yahweh He "will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible";[14] and He punishes perverse self-will.[15] Chaldea is spoiled because she rejoiced over the ruin of Israel.[16] *Malachi*

[1] Ezek. iii. 20, xiii., xxii. 23 ff.; Mal. ii. 8. [2] P. 211.
[3] Ezek. xxii. 7; Mal. iii. 5. [4] Ezek. xxii. 7.
[5] Mal. ii. 14. [6] Isa. lviii. 4. [7] Isa. xlvii. 6.
[8] Isa. lix. 13; Ezek. xvii. 16; Zech. v. 4; Mal. iii. 5.
[9] Zech. v. 3. [10] Isa. lix. 3.
[11] Ezek. xlv. 9 f., xlvi. 16 f. [12] Pp. 266 f.
[13] Isa. lvii. 15, lxvi. 2; Ezek. xxviii. 2.
[14] Isa. xiii. 11. [15] Isa. lxvi. 1-4. [16] Jer. l. 10.

and *Second Isaiah* imply that unbelief is a sin.[1] The Jews are reproached because they forget Yahweh, and are overwhelmed with fear of human oppressors; and those who trust in Yahweh shall possess the land and inherit the holy mountain.[2] The Servant of Yahweh is trustful, docile, meek, devoted to the service of God and Man.

On the other hand, Israel is condemned for hypocrisy; they swear by the name of Yahweh, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth, nor in righteousness.[3]

In all these passages, however, the writers are chiefly interested in the external manifestation of the inner qualities.

Classification.

There is no classification of virtues and vices. The latter, for instance, are not formally divided into sins against man and against God; nor into ceremonial, moral, and spiritual offences; nor into sins of thought, word, and deed. In Ezekiel's descriptions of the righteous and the wicked, idolatry and adultery are named in the same breath with nothing whatever to indicate that they belong to different categories.[4] Later on the secular and ecclesiastical duties of the prince are similarly combined with each other and with regulations about priests and sacrifices.[5] Even the prophets who are specially occupied with Temple and ritual mingle the moral and the ceremonial.[6] As Davidson says, "our modern distinction of moral and ceremonial is unknown to the law";[7] neither is it

[1] Pp. 48, 101.
[2] Isa. li. 12 f., lvii. 13.
[3] Isa. xlviii. 1, lviii. 2 ff.
[4] P. 263.
[5] Ezek. xlv. 9 ff., 16 ff.
[6] Joel iii. 3, 19; Zech. v.; Mal. iii. 5. The brevity of *Haggai* is sufficient justification for the absence of purely ethical teaching.
[7] *A.B.D.*, p. 349.

formally recognised by the prophets. At the same time a certain antithesis between the moral and ceremonial is implied by the teaching of the older prophets as to the ethical demands of Yahweh and the uselessness of ritual apart from response to such demands. In the later prophets this teaching occasionally reappears, especially in connexion with fasts. The popular religion of post-exilic times attached special importance to fasting; but two passages[1] declare that Yahweh prefers benevolence and justice, and the observance of the Sabbath, to fasts. But if in the earlier prophets we may discern a tendency to set the ethical demands of Yahweh above ritual customs, this is lost in their post-exilic successors. The attitude of some writers towards fasting is the exception that proves the rule.

An important distinction is drawn in the Old Testament which roughly corresponds to the distinction between heinous and venial sins. Sins may be committed through error[2] or without knowledge; they may even be hidden from the sinner so that he cannot discern them.[3] Other sins are committed "with a high hand," *i.e.* consciously, deliberately, with a full sense that they are sins.[4] It is for the sins committed through error that the sacrificial ritual is chiefly appointed.[5] Accordingly the ritual of Ezekiel's days of atonement is performed on behalf of "him that erreth and is simple".[6]

[1] Isa. lviii.; Zech. vii., viii. 18 f.

[2] שְׁגָגָה, *shegāgâ.* [3] Psalm xix. 12.

[4] It is doubtful whether "presumptuous sins" in Psalm xix. 13 is a correct rendering.

[5] Lev. iv.; Num. xv. [6] Ezek. xlv. 20.

The same idea of a distinction between heinous and venial sins underlies the passages which speak of a discrimination between sinners who may be purified and forgiven, and those who must be cut off.[1]

The acts and qualities of which we have been speaking concerned Israel as well as the individual Israelite, as the sin of Achan brought disaster on the whole people. The land is defiled by the worship of idols,[2] and the sins of individuals. The sanctuary itself, the symbol and centre of the fellowship of Yahweh with His people, needs cleansing and atonement, even on account of the sins of those who "err and are simple".[3] Israel.

The righteousness of Israel is chiefly considered with reference to its inner condition. The prophets seldom deal with the action of Israel as a nation towards other nations. At the outset of our period, however, at the close of the Monarchy and the beginning of the Exile, righteousness is not the normal condition of Israel. Ezekiel, following Jeremiah, stigmatises the nation as wholly wicked. The corruption of his own time throws its dark shadow back along the whole course of history; and he teaches the doctrine of the total depravity of Israel throughout its existence as a nation.[4] The sins of Israel are specially cruel and immoral heathen superstitions, and the failure to maintain social order, justice, and mutual beneficence. The idolatry of the people is set forth under the figures of fornication and adultery with Assyria, Egypt, the Chaldeans, and the Philistines.[5] Isaiah had also condemned the political intrigues and

[1] Pp. 296 f. [2] Ezek. xxxvi. 18.
[3] Ezek. xlv. 18 ff. [4] P. 18.
[5] Ezek. xvi., xxiii.; see Kraetzschmar on xvi., and *cf.* xx. 8, 24.

alliances with Assyria and Egypt, and probably Ezekiel's figurative language includes a similar condemnation.[1] The wickedness of Israel is shown by the corruption of the official classes, king,[2] princes,[3] priests,[4] and prophets.[5] Israel was worse than the heathen nations, even than Sodom.[6] In Second Isaiah the sin of Israel falls into the background; in its more fatal forms it is a thing of the past. In *Haggai* and *Zechariah* the Jews are condemned for their neglect of the Temple and other sins, but repentance and amendment are cheerfully anticipated. In *Malachi*, Zechariah ix.-xiv., Isaiah lvi.-lxvi., the judgment on the community is almost as severe as that of Ezekiel and Jeremiah; but there is more recognition of redeeming features, and more hope for the immediate future; the community is suffering from a disease from which it will recover; it does not need to die and rise again.

We have seen that the idea of the righteousness of the Israel of his times is foreign to Ezekiel; Israel's only claim to its unique position is the mysterious Divine election and the loyalty of Yahweh to His purposes.[7] In his scheme of the New Israel the ceremonial cleanness of the land and people, and the maintenance of a satisfactory ritual, are much more prominent than justice and beneficence.[8]

In the Second Isaiah, however, Israel is thought of as righteous; partly in a purely forensic sense, the deliverance and restoration of Israel is a Divine sentence of

[1] Bertholet on Ezek. xvi. 26.
[2] Ezek. xliii. 7.
[3] Ezek. viii. 11, xi. 1.
[4] Ezek. xxii. 26.
[5] Ezek. xiii. Ezek. v. 6 f., xvi. 48.
[7] P. 20. [8] P. 21.

acquittal, a declaration that Israel is in the right as against its enemies.[1] Corresponding to this, Israel possesses an inherent righteousness which is well summed up by Dr. Skinner[2] thus: "Several elements appear to enter into it: (*a*) Israel is in the right, first of all, as having suffered wrong at the hands of the world power. The triumph of Babylon has been the triumph of brute force over helpless innocence." "I was wroth with my people, I profaned mine inheritance: thou didst show them no mercy; upon the aged hast thou very heavily laid thy yoke."[3] Another element: "(*b*) Righteousness includes, in the second place, a way of life in accordance with the law of God". The people or a section taken to represent the people are appealed to thus, "Hearken to me, ye that follow righteousness, ye that seek Yahweh".[4] Then "(*c*) There is, perhaps, another element to be taken into account: Israel is in the right in virtue of its being identified with the cause of Yahweh, the only true God".[5] So far as Israel may be identified with the Missionary Servant of Yahweh who brings truth and salvation to the world, and gives His life for its redemption, the idea of the national righteousness of Israel reaches its climax; it is exhibited as perfect loyalty and surrender to God together with self-sacrificing devotion to mankind.

In *Haggai*, *Zechariah* and *Joel* we have the same idea that Israel is in the right as against its oppressors. The "shaking" of the nations is to usher in the glory of the Temple.[6] The horns of the nations which scattered

[1] Isa. xlv. 8, 24, liv. 14, 17; *cf.* Skinner.
[2] *D.B.*, Art. "Righteousness".
[3] Isa. xlvii. 6; *cf.* lii. 3 ff.
[4] Isa. li. 1.
[5] *Cf.* p. 76.
[6] Hag. ii. 6, 21; Zech. i. 11.

Judah are to be cast down.[1] In the Day of Yahweh, He will gather all nations, and plead with them for His people and His heritage; especially Egypt and Edom shall be punished "for the violence done to the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land".[2]

We have also in the later writers the idea of the inherent righteousness of Israel; it is "the righteous nation which keepeth truth".[3] In this righteousness, as in *Ezekiel*, moral, ritual, and ceremonial elements are blended.

There is no real contradiction between the condemnation of Israel by Ezekiel and the justification of Israel by his successors. Ezekiel's Israel is the whole ancient people judged in the light of their moral and spiritual failure, and of the ruin of the state. The righteous Israel is the people as represented by the prophets and their disciples, succeeded by the community chastened and purged by the discipline of the Exile and the final defection of unworthy members. In the post-exilic prophets the true Israel only includes the righteous: sinners are to be cut off by a Divine judgment.

The Gentiles.

The Gentiles, not being the people of Yahweh but the worshippers of other gods, stood in a somewhat undefined relation to righteousness and sin. They and their lands were by nature unclean, and in earlier times they were not thought of as possible worshippers of Yahweh, unless they virtually ceased to be Assyrians or Egyptians, and become *gerim*, or resident aliens, or, as we should say, naturalised Jews. But as the

[1] Zech. i. 21.
[2] Joel iii. 2, 19; *cf.* Isa. xxvi. 5, 6, xxvii. 1.
[3] Isa. xxvi. 1.

prophets became more and more formally conscious of the unique deity and universal supremacy of Yahweh, they necessarily taught that it was the duty of the Gentiles to recognise this supremacy and to do homage to Yahweh by worshipping at Jerusalem. A few passages even suggest a complete union of Jews and Gentiles as worshippers of Yahweh;[1] but, as a rule, it is not clear what is involved in Gentile homage to Yahweh. They might, for instance, acknowledge His supremacy, without keeping the Law or even abandoning the worship of their own gods. Some of the verses in which it is said that the Gentiles shall "know that I am Yahweh," remind us of the saying that "the devils believe and tremble".

Often the Gentiles seem to be judged by their behaviour to Israel, enmity to the Chosen People being sin against Yahweh. Ammon, Moab and Tyre are punished because they rejoiced over the calamities of Judah; Edom because it "dealt against the house of Judah by taking vengeance"; and Egypt because it was "a staff of reed to the house of Israel".[2]

At the same time the Gentiles are blamed for moral defects, pride, cruelty, and injustice.[3]

For the most part the references of our prophets to the Gentiles might be summed up in the saying "the whole world lieth in sin"; more than once the heathen nations are gathered together to be condemned and punished. Similarly it is said, "The earth also is polluted under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant".[4]

[1] Pp. 187 f. [2] Ezek. xxv. 3, 8, 12, xxvi. 2, xxix. 6; *cf.* Joel iii.
[3] Isa. xiv. 5 f. [4] Isa. xxiv. 5; for the interpretation, *cf.* Duhm.

This last passage implies the existence of standards of righteousness, known to, and binding on, the Gentiles, "laws," "ordinances," together with a "covenant," bringing them into formal relation with God. The phrase "everlasting covenant" is a reference to the promise after the Flood: "the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon earth".[1] This covenant is connected with the prohibition of murder.[2] Apparently, therefore, in this late passage we find the idea of the Priestly Code that, apart from the special Revelation to Israel, certain elementary principles of morality are binding on men in general. Naturally this is assumed by the prophets in dealing with the conduct of the Gentiles, but rather as a habit of thought acquired in dealing with Israel, and unconsciously extended to other peoples, than as a deliberately formulated doctrine.

In some passages the attitude towards the Gentiles seems unduly harsh, especially towards Edom[3] and Moab; it almost seems as if, because they were Gentiles, they were so wicked that no treatment could be too cruel for them. Yahweh stirs up the Medes against Babylon to massacre even the young children;[4] but we must remember that similar punishment is inflicted on Israel.[5]

On the other hand, a measure of righteousness is sometimes recognised among the Gentiles. Second Isaiah speaks with sympathy and appreciation of Cyrus as the deliverer of Israel. Job is named[6] among the ancient

[1] Gen. ix. 16, Priestly Code.
[2] Gen ix. 5, 6.
[3] P. 191.
[4] Isa. xiii. 16 ff.
[5] Hos. xiii. 16.
[6] Ezek. xiv. 14, 20.

examples of conspicuous virtue; and probably, according to tradition, Job was not an Israelite. The heathen sailors in *Jonah* are generous and conscientious; they are anxious to save the prophet's life even at the risk of their own. The Gentiles are sometimes spoken of as susceptible to the appeals of true religion, capable of repentance and faith. The men of Nineveh repent at the preaching of Jonah; and Isaiah lvi. makes practical provision for the treatment of foreigners resident in Judah who adopt the faith of Israel.

Causes.

Frequent promises and threats recognise that self-interest, anxiety to secure pleasure and profit, to avoid pain and loss, constantly determines conduct to both the observance and violation of law, human and divine. Other appeals recognise that men are influenced by gratitude, by natural affection, by a sense of duty. In other words, obedience and disobedience are the results of motives acting on the nature of Man. That nature is originally the work of God; it is influenced by Him for good and evil; and may be so changed by Him as to become altogether predisposed to righteousness.[1] Here and there we find indications that character is thought of as hereditary; some such view underlies the frequent references to the sins of the fathers, and explains the care with which Ezekiel traces the wickedness of Israel throughout its history. It is possib e that we have a reference to the Fall, as the origin of sin, in the statement, "Thy first father sinned".[2] The sin of Jerusalem is partly explained by its Canaanite origin: "The Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was an

[1] Pp. 176 ff., which see for problem of origin of evil.

[2] Isa. xliii. 27.

Hittite," and "as is the mother, so is her daughter".[1] The moral and spiritual fall of Jerusalem, *i.e.* Israel, is explained by Ezekiel. The perfect beauty and majesty bestowed upon her by Yahweh made her famous throughout the nations. She became intoxicated with her splendour, prosperity and glory; and in her self-confidence she gave the reins to selfish and corrupt appetites.[2]

It is commonly stated that the Old Testament teaches that sin is due to the action of the Free Will of man. Smend,[3] for instance, writes of Ezekiel: "He is convinced that each man has in himself the power to turn from sin . . . and thus makes an important contribution to the doctrine[4] of the prophets, that all sin springs from human free will". How far the language of the prophets necessitates the doctrine of free will as an ultimate deduction is a question we must leave for metaphysicians; but there is no evidence that our prophets had considered the problem.

We may notice here two special points. Men may be so good as to obtain deliverance through their own merits; thus,[5] "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel and Job, were in it, they should but save their own lives by their righteousness".

Special Points.

Again, "wickedness"[6] is in one passage personified as an evil power which is to be removed from Judah, and domiciled in Chaldea.

[1] Ezek. xvi. 3, 44. [2] Ezek. xvi. 14 f.
[3] P. 112; *cf.* Schultz, ii., 197.
[4] Literally "conviction," *Ueberzeugung*.
[5] Ezek. xiv. 14. [6] רִשְׁעָה, *rish'â*, Zech. v. 5-11.

We may briefly summarise the teaching of our prophets as to Righteousness and Sin thus. They are concerned chiefly with concrete acts, circumstances, and conditions;[1] a man is righteous when his acts conform to a divinely appointed standard; wicked, when they diverge from this standard. Righteousness includes morality, correct ritual, and a certain attitude of mind towards God. Morality is concerned with social order, justice and benevolence. Ritual consists of material acts and conditions; it is required that special persons and places, and ordinary persons at special times, shall be in a physical state called "sacred";[2] and that all persons, things, and places shall be in a physical state called "clean"[3] at all times, as far as possible. A man may lapse from these physical states through carelessness, ignorance, or accident, and so may unintentionally become unpleasing to God, and unfit to approach His sanctuary.

Summary.

When we pass to the right attitude of mind towards God, we get beyond the objective righteousness chiefly emphasised. This attitude includes faith or trust, docility, humility, penitence, and love.[4]

Sin is the doing or being that which is not righteous and the failing to do or be that which is righteous.[5]

There is no complete or formal discussion of the causes and origin of sin, but the following seems to be suggested

[1] Köberle, p. 215, points out that Ezekiel is less concerned with inner motives than Hosea.

[2] *Qādôsh.* [3] *Tāhōr.*

[4] Isa. lvi. 6.

[5] Certain uses of the Hebrew *çedeq*, *e.g.*, its use in the sense of "victory," do not belong to our present subject.

as a partial explanation. Conduct, righteous or sinful, is due to the nature of an individual or a people acting under the influence of circumstances, Nature, Man and God. Character, righteous or sinful, is due to heredity, to the previous history of a man or a people, and to Divine influence.

CHAPTER IX.

REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

Some of the terms used express the idea of equity. Words used in ordinary life for payment are used for moral recompense of both righteousness and sin. The more common are *gāmal*, "deal fully or adequately with,"[1] and *shillēm*,[2] literally "complete," often used in the special sense of "pay," payment completing a transaction, and then in the moral sense of recompense. Often the perfectly general *nāthan*,[3] "give," is used for giving what is just. Terms.

Again, Yahweh "visits"[4] men to reward or punish; as if His attention to human affairs involved a just recompense of good and evil.

Other words represent punishment as the result of God's personal resentment against sin. He manifests His anger, fury, or indignation,[5] and takes vengeance[6]

[1] גָּמַל, so *B.D.B.* [2] שִׁלֵּם. [3] נָתַן.

[4] פָּקַד, *pāqadh*, Isa. xxvi. 14, Zech. x. 3.

[5] אַף, *'aph*, חָרוֹן, *ḥārôn*, חֵמָה, *ḥēmâ*, זַעַם, *za'am*, קֶצֶף, *qeṣeph*.

[6] נָקַם, *nāqām*.

on the sinner. Thus "the day of vengeance" is in the heart of the Champion of Israel.[1] And it is said of the Philistines, "I will execute great vengeance upon them with furious rebukes; and they shall know that I am Yahweh when I lay My vengeance upon them".[2]

If we may accept the ordinary view[3] that *'āwôn* is used alike for "iniquity, guilt, and punishment," we get the suggestion that punishment is closely bound up with sin, organically connected with it, almost another aspect of it. Similarly the same word *hatt'āth*[4] is used both for "sin" and "sin-offering"; the latter being a kind of penalty.

Sometimes mysterious.

At times the Israelite contemplated the dealings of Yahweh in hopeless bewilderment. They seemed to be dictated by the arbitrary caprice of a blind fate; as when Yahweh met Moses in the inn and sought to slay him;[5] or when David surmised that Yahweh had stirred up Saul against him.[6] Naturally this is not the usual attitude of the prophets who are in the counsels of God; but it can be traced in some passages of our books. Even Second Isaiah exclaims, "Verily Thou art a God that hidest Thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour"; and he tells us that the people complained, "My way is hid from Yahweh, and my judgment is passed away from my God,"[7] *i.e.*,

[1] Isa. lxiii. 4. [2] Ezek. xxv. 17.

[3] So *B.D.B.*; Siegfried and Stade, however, do not recognise the meaning "punishment," and give to עָוֹן, *'āwôn*, the sense of "guilt" in most of the passages where it is usually rendered "punishment". In any case, "bear their iniquity," Ezek. xliv. 10, 12, etc., means "undergo" or "remain liable to the consequences of iniquity".

[4] P. 258. [5] Exod. iv. 24. [6] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

[7] Isa. xlv. 15, xl. 27.

God is no longer anxious that His people should have their just rights. At other times men considered the terrible calamities that had befallen Israel, the frailty of human nature, and the helpless dependence of man upon God; and wondered at His severity.[1] In the dark days after the Return when piety languished in want and humiliation, men complained, "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of Yahweh, and He delighteth in them. . . . Where is the God of justice. . . . It is vain to serve God: and what profit is it that we have kept His charge and walked mournfully before Yahweh Çebāôth? Now we call the proud happy; yea, they that work wickedness are built up; yea, they tempt God, and are delivered."[2]

But speaking generally, the doctrine that righteousness and sin meet with a due recompense is fundamental and universal in the Old Testament. The terms[3] used for recompense imply equitable and adequate recognition of good and evil deeds. When Yahweh's attention is called to sin, His anger burns against the wrong-doer, and He takes vengeance on him as for a personal offence; probably suffering and sin are thought of as organically connected.

General Principle.

The principle of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; the principle that men and nations are punished by being made to suffer what they have inflicted on others, is insisted on by our prophets. Babylon that enslaved Israel shall herself become a slave.[4] "The house of Israel

[1] Isa. lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12.

[2] Mal. ii. 17, iii. 14, 15. These problems are the subject of *Job* and some of the Psalms.

[3] P. 277.

[4] Isa. xlvii. 1-3.

. . . shall take them captive, whose captives they were; and they shall rule over their oppressors."[1] Because Edom and the Philistines had taken vengeance upon Israel, Yahweh would take vengeance on them.[2] Because Tyre and Zidon and the Philistines had sold Jews as slaves to the Greeks, "that ye might remove them far from their border," God would sell their sons and daughters to the Jews, "and they shall sell them to the men of Sheba, to a nation far off".[3]

The general principle that righteousness is rewarded and sin punished is frequently emphasised. "Oh that thou hadst hearkened to My commandments! Then had thy prosperity been as a river, and thine honour as the waves of the sea";[4] the meaning of the latter clause is that the fact that Israel stood in right relations to Yahweh would be manifested by deliverance and victory. Yahweh tells the righteous that he shall surely live;[5] and the wicked that he shall surely die. "There is no peace, saith Yahweh, for the wicked;" and again, "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid His face from you, that He will not hear".[6] Most of the teaching of our prophets, as of the Old Testament generally, might be summed up in the proverb, "Righteousness guardeth him that is upright in the way, but wickedness overthroweth the sinner".[7]

The majority of passages, like the one we have just quoted, content themselves with dividing men into the righteous and the wicked, and assigning rewards to the

[1] Isa. xiv. 2. [2] Ezek. xxv. 12-17. [3] Joel iii. 6, 8.
[4] Isa. xlviii., R.V. "thy peace," "thy righteousness".
[5] Ezek. xxxiii. 13 f. [6] Isa. xlviii. 22, lix. 2.
[7] Prov. xiii. 6.

one and punishments to the other. They do not consider the more complex problems arising out of the presence of good and evil in the character and conduct of a single individual. These, however, are partially dealt with in two sections of *Ezekiel*,[1] which discuss the cases of lives which are at one time righteous and at another wicked. The principle laid down is that at any given time a man is treated according to his mode of life at that time; his conduct in former periods is not taken into account. "The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression; and as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness. . . . When I say to the righteous that he shall surely live; if he . . . commit iniquity, none of his righteous deeds shall be remembered; but in his iniquity that he hath committed therein shall he die. Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right . . . he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be remembered against him . . . he shall surely live."[2] The special form of these statements is due to the particular circumstances[3] of the time when they were written; but any attempt to apply them to actual conditions would discover in them the principle that a man's conduct at once met with a suitable recompense; from point to point of his life his good deeds are promptly rewarded and his sins summarily punished; no balance is carried forward; a man has not to reckon with any past except that which

[1] Ezek. xviii., xxxiii. 10-20.

[2] Ezek. xxxiii. 13-16, xviii. 21-32, to the same effect.

[3] P. 32.

is quite recent. It does not follow, however, that Ezekiel would have been prepared for such a generalisation from his special cases; it would no doubt have seemed an ideal principle for the manifestation of Divine justice; but the prophet was far too practical to have persuaded himself that the moral government of the world was invariably administered thus with mathematical accuracy. But there are passages which show that prompt and adequate retribution was regarded as the normal law. The sudden death of a leader of the anti-prophetic party is regarded as a Divine judgment.[1] Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi tell us that as long as the Jews neglected to make proper provision for public worship, they suffered from manifold misfortunes; but all three promise that as soon as the people repent of their neglect and make amends, blessings shall be poured out upon them.[2]

The illustrations and statements cited refer partly to individuals, partly to Israel; the same general principles of recompense and retribution apply to both, and also to heathen nations. The Deuteronomic editor tells the story of the Judges in such a way as to indicate that the fortunes of Israel exactly corresponded to their loyalty or disloyalty to Yahweh.

As far as our prophets are concerned, the recompense of conduct is in this life, on the earth;[3] and it is chiefly found in material prosperity or misfortune. Ezekiel speaks of the reward of the righteous as "life," "he shall surely live," and the

Nature.

[1] Ezek. xi. 1-13. It is convenient to use the term "prophetic party" for the supporters of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, though, as a matter of fact, most of the professional prophets were opposed to them.

[2] Hag. i. 6-11, ii. 15-19; Zech. viii. 9-12; Mal. iii. 7-12.

[3] *Cf.* below; also for an apparent exception, p. 284.

punishment of the wicked as "death," "he shall surely die".[1] Similarly the covenant of Yahweh with Levi was "of life and peace".[2] If men observe the law of God, they "live in" or "by it"; but to the wicked laws are given whereby they may not live, which will bring them to death.[3] Moral hardening is sometimes a penalty of sin. "Death" is used as a general term for punishment, because it is the most conspicuous and complete penalty. In some cases Ezekiel is thinking of the Day of Yahweh, and the judgment which determines the citizens of the Kingdom of God, excluding the sinner by death, and preserving the righteous alive; and this usage may have provided him with a nomenclature for general purposes. "Death" becomes, as Schultz[4] says, "the full penalty of Divine justice. . . . Death includes everything which is a result of sin. Since bodily death is usually taken for granted as the normal end of human life, it is only special, premature, or violent modes of death which prove . . . its penal character. . . . Life, on the other hand, is everything which results from communion with God—an earthly existence, never shortened by a judgment; a resting in God, a rejoicing in Him." The content of life and death according to our prophets must be gathered from their detailed accounts of rewards and punishments. Jerusalem is chastised by the sack of the city and the massacre of its inhabitants. The guilty land is made desolate by sword, famine, wild beasts, and pestilence.[5] In the ideal future all the faithful servants of God shall live to a good old age.[6] Sinful men and nations are

[1] P. 18. [2] Mal. ii. 5. [3] Ezek. xx. 11, 25.
[4] Schultz, ii., 310, 316 f.; *cf.* Köberle, pp. 218 f.
[5] Ezek. v., xiv. 12-23. [6] Isa. lxv. 20; Zech. viii. 4.

afflicted with bad harvests, drought, barrenness of cattle and wives, lack of renumerative employment, mutual dissension.[1] Disease, especially, is a penalty of sin; Ezekiel follows Jeremiah in emphasising the pestilence as an instrument of Divine justice.[2] Invasion, defeat in battle, exile, captivity; indeed, every form of material calamity which can befall man or nation is, or may be, the punishment of sin.

In a fashion the penalties of sin pursued men beyond life; men were concerned not only as to what might happen to them while living, but also as to the fate of their body and their family after death. The corpse of the sinner might be cast forth unburied;[3] his family might become extinct, and his name be forgotten.[4]

When Israel is thought of as enjoying the favour of Yahweh, the sinful Israelite is punished by being excluded from the Chosen People, a penalty which involves misery and a speedy death.[5]

On the other hand, righteousness is rewarded by prosperity of every kind. The individual is admitted to all the privileges of Israel;[6] he enjoys health, wealth, and peace; his farming and trading prosper; he lives to a good old age, is buried in the family grave, and leaves behind him a large and flourishing family to keep alive his memory.

The righteous nation enjoys fertile seasons, social

[1] Hag. i.; Zech. viii.; Mal. iii. 11.

[2] Ezek. vi. 12 and *passim*. [3] Isa. xiv. 19, 20.

[4] Isa. xiv. 21, 22, lvi. 5, lxvi. 24.

[5] Isa. lxv. 13-16; *cf.* the standing phrase of the Priestly Code, "shall be cut off from among His people," Num. xv. 30.

[6] Isa. lvi. 1-7.

order, dominion over its neighbours, wealth and distinction, and a large and flourishing population.

Recompense, however, is not entirely material; the presence of Yahweh and the maintenance of the Temple services are reckoned amongst the privileges of Israel and the Israelite, granted to them for their righteousness; while the withdrawal of Yahweh is a punishment of the sin of Israel, and exclusion from the Temple services a penalty inflicted on the individual. The righteous Israel is also rewarded by receiving the Divine Revelation, and by the vindication of its righteousness before the world.[1]

The doctrine of the invariably prompt and equitable recompense of righteousness and sin by material prosperity or suffering, involved its converse; namely, that prosperity was a sign of righteousness and suffering a token of sin. In future times the splendour of *Zion* will be a sign of the Divine approval.[2] Joel does not say in so many words that the plague of locusts is an indication that the people had fallen into grievous sin, but this is implied by the whole tenor of the book. The sailors in *Jonah* conclude that the storm is a token of sin on the part of some one on board. Haggai reminds the Jews of their many misfortunes,[3] which he expects them to take as evidence of Divine displeasure. When men were obviously wicked, their prosperity was taken to mean that Yahweh delighted in them, though they were evil.[4] The suffering and disease of the Servant of Yahweh led men to think of Him as smitten by a Divine judgment.[5]

Suffering a symptom of Sin.

This interpretation of suffering is not formally endorsed

[1] Isa. xlviii. 18, lx.; Mal. iii. [2] Isa. lxii. 1-5.
[3] Hag. i. 6-11. [4] Mal. ii. 17. [5] Isa. liii. 4.

by our prophets as a universal truth; and it is expressly denied by *Job* and the Servant passages; but such views commend themselves to prosperous people, and have usually held their own in popular theology, so that our Lord's disciples wondered whether a man's blindness was due to his own sin or that of his parents;[1] and men now often regard their neighbours' misfortunes as "judgments".

Recompense delayed.

It was often obvious that the doctrine of exact and prompt recompense was at variance with experience, and it was accordingly modified in various ways. For instance, the execution of Divine justice might be delayed. Our prophets constantly imply that perfect moral government of the world is not attained in the period at which they speak, but they declare that a Day of Yahweh is imminent when all wrongs will be redressed, and all iniquity punished.[2] Meanwhile Yahweh is not unmindful of the claims of the righteous; He hearkens and hears, and a book of remembrance is written before Him, for them that fear Yahweh and think upon His name.[3] The experiences of the present might be regarded as an instalment towards the payment of a debt which would be fully discharged in the Day of Yahweh; or if the sinner prospered and the saint suffered, these untoward circumstances would be altogether reversed "in that day".[4]

Unfortunately the doctrine that retribution might be deferred was unduly comforting to the sinner. Men were

[1] John ix. 2.

[2] Isa. lxi. 2; Ezek. xxx. 3; Joel; Obad. 15; Zech. xiv.; Mal. iv. 1; *cf.* below.

[3] Mal. iii. 16. [4] Mal. iii.; *cf.* Köberle, p. 358.

tempted to say with Ezekiel's contemporaries, "The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of times that are far off". It even became a proverb that "The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth". The prophets constantly insist that the Day of Yahweh is at hand. Thus Ezekiel replies, "The days are at hand . . . it shall no more be deferred; for in your days, O rebellious house, will I speak the word and will perform it";[1] and again, "Keep ye judgment, and do righteousness; for My deliverance is near to come, and My righteousness to be revealed".[2] Yet the history of Israel, according to Ezekiel, was an unbroken career of wickedness; nevertheless its doom was deferred till the end of the Monarchy.[3]

Vicarious Suffering.

The doctrine that justice though slow was sure did not meet the case of a good man cut off by a violent death in early years. It was, indeed, always possible to follow the example of Job's friends, and allege that the man who came to an untimely end was a gross hypocrite whose apparent goodness was a cloak for secret sin. But it was impossible for honest men endowed with moral discrimination always to take this view. Some schools of modern theology would allege that the best of men were so bad that they deserved the worst that God could inflict. There are passages in which the writers make some such confession on behalf of Israel: "We are all become as one that is unclean, and all our righteousnesses are as a polluted garment".[4] But if all are alike guilty before God, there is

[1] Ezek. xii. 21-28. [2] Isa. lvi. 1; *cf.* Obad. 15; Joel iii. 14.
[3] For the case of the Servant of Yahweh, see below.
[4] Isa. lxiv. 6; *cf.* lix. 12 ff.

no reason why one man should be treated differently from another. Even this passage speaks of those on whose behalf the confession is made as "Thy people," "Thy holy people," and implies that they have a right to be better treated than their "adversaries"; is not Yahweh their Father and their Maker?[1] Elsewhere the prophets recognise the existence of the two classes "righteous" and "wicked," and teach that they deserve different treatment.

The difficulty was sometimes met by the principle of Vicarious Suffering. When the community was punished and rewarded as a whole, the sin of the wicked involved the righteous in calamity; the sins of an evil generation might be visited on their successors. Ezekiel and Second Isaiah often speak of ruin or deliverance coming upon the whole people. Ezekiel says expressly, "Thus saith Yahweh: Behold I am against thee, and will draw forth My sword out of its sheath, and will cut off from thee the righteous and the wicked".[2] But for the most part the exilic and post-exilic prophets teach that there will be a judgment within the nation.[3] For instance, when the destroying angels are sent to slay the inhabitants of Jerusalem, a mark is set "upon the foreheads of the men who sigh and cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof" that they may be spared.[4] Hence the sufferings of the righteous could hardly be justified by the view that they were involved in the guilt and punishment of their people.

But the doctrine that the Jews in later times suffered for the sins of ancient Israel mostly held its ground.

[1] Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8 f.
[2] Ezek. xxi. 3, 4.
[3] P. 19.
[4] Ezek. ix.

The Monarchy fell on account of the wickedness of Manasseh.[1] Yahweh declares that He will punish sinners thus: "I will recompense into their bosom, your own iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together".[2] The doctrine maintained itself in Jewish literature till after the beginning of the Christian Era.[3]

Such teaching, however, was inconsistent with Ezekiel's theory of retribution;[4] and he insists on the continuous wickedness of Israel; the iniquity of his own day is the nadir of a long course of degradation, and fully justifies the severest punishment, quite apart from the earlier history. This last point is not put in so many words, but it is implied. For one thing, Ezekiel dwells frequently at great length on the corruption of all classes of the Jews of his times, both in Judah and in Chaldea; for another, he introduces his chief statement of his doctrine of retribution by a reference to this subject.

Following Jeremiah, as usual, he takes for his text the popular proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge".[5] According to the more probable translation,[6] this proverb was spoken "concerning the land of Israel," and on other grounds we know that this proverb represented a popular view of the cause of the misfortunes of the Jews at that time. They were suffering for the sins of former generations. "Our fathers sinned and are not," said they, "and we have borne their iniquities."[7]

[1] 2 Kings xxiv. 3; Jer. xv. 4.
[2] Isa. lxv. 7.
[3] Köberle, p. 415 ff.
[4] Ezek. xviii.
[5] Ezek. xviii. 1; *cf.* Jer. xxxi. 29.
[6] R.V. text, R.V. mg., "in the land of Israel".
[7] Lam. v. 7.

In his discussion of the proverb, however, the national application is dropped, and only individuals are considered, so that, instead of the question of the responsibility of an Israelite for the sins of his fellow-citizens, past or present, we have the somewhat different question of the responsibility of a man for his family, especially for his father or his son. Current theology [1] sometimes explained the sufferings of the righteous or the prosperity of the wicked by the theory that they were being recompensed for the conduct of their fathers. Thus we read,[2] "Prepare ye slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers," and Ezekiel himself tells us that such views were commonly accepted. He not only quotes the proverb we have cited, but after he has expressly denied the doctrine that the father suffers for the sins of his children and the son for the sins of his father, he represents the people as objecting, "Wherefore doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?" [3] In other words, according to current theology, Ezekiel's teaching was a heretical innovation. As we have seen,[4] the opinion which Ezekiel attacked survived till the time of Christ.

An entirely different explanation of the sufferings of the righteous is given in connexion with the Servant of Yahweh. He suffers willingly in order that others may be relieved of the penalty of sin: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement (which secured) our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. . . . Yahweh hath laid on him the iniquity of us all . . . for the transgression of My people was he stricken . . . he bare the sin of

[1] *Cf.* pp. 31 f.
[2] Isa. xiv. 21.
[3] Ezek. xviii. 19.
[4] P. 286.

many and made intercession for the transgressors."[1] The reference, probably,[2] is to the mediation of the ideal Israel on behalf of the world, but the principle might readily be applied to the sufferings of righteous individuals. Indeed it was no doubt derived from the experience that such sufferings did exercise a redeeming influence.

Ezekiel's polemic against the doctrine that the righteous suffered for the sins of their family prepared the way for the teaching of Isaiah liii.

Our prophets do not deal with the case of the bad man who lives a long and prosperous life, and dies at last in a good old age, leaving a flourishing family behind him. Such careers were no doubt known to the sceptics with whom Malachi argued, and they would not fail to cite them; a well-known picture of this kind in the Psalter might have been drawn by one of those who complained that Yahweh delighted in evil-doers.[3] The imminent judgment which Malachi predicted would not touch the sinner who was already dead; and the prophet apparently had no explanation to offer of such anomalies; at any rate he ignores them.

A conspicuous instance of unmerited suffering is given in the latter part of *Zechariah*. The shepherd who is the "fellow" of Yahweh, the "good shepherd" as we should say, is slain.[4] If this passage is independent of Zechariah xii. 1 - xiii. 6, we have the bare fact that a man of conspicuous righteousness perishes by a violent death. It is possible, however, that Zechariah xii. 10, "they shall look on him whom they have pierced, and shall mourn

[1] Isa. liii. 5 f., 8, 12; *cf.* 10 f.
[2] P. 52.
[3] Ps. xvii. 13 f.
[4] Zech. xiii. 7.

for him,"[1] is a reference to the good shepherd and to his death as a martyr. The mourning for him is a further tribute to his character, and an acknowledgment of the guilt of the Jews who put him to death. If there is no connexion between the two passages, we have a second instance of the good man failing to meet with a due recompense. However this may be, there is no attempt to discuss the difficulties involved. The writers are preoccupied with actual historical events which they are describing, and show no interest in speculative questions.

Purpose of Punishment.

At some stages of religious development sin and suffering seem organically connected; sinful and harmful are synonymous; it does not occur to men to discuss why sin should bring suffering. We have seen[2] that a probable use of *'āwôn*, "iniquity," preserves a trace of this mode of thought. Ezekiel's doctrine[3] that a man's fortunes always vary exactly as the moral quality of his conduct would suggest an organic connexion between the two. But the prophets never allow the working of an invariable law to make them less sensible of the Divine activity. For them retribution is always the fulfilling of a deliberate purpose of God. As such it would hardly need explanation. Men confer benefits on those whose conduct they approve and inflict suffering on those who rouse their anger. The prevalent anthropopathism[4] would ascribe similar action to Yahweh. "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh,"

[1] The text is probably corrupt, and no certain restoration is possible, but it is clear that the general sense is as given above. The reading of E.V., "they shall look on *me* whom they have pierced," cannot be correct; *cf.* Wellhausen.

[2] P. 278. [3] P. 281. [4] P. 146.

writes Ezekiel, "This is Jerusalem . . . because ye have not walked in My statutes . . . I shall execute judgments in thee in anger and in fury, in furious rebukes."[1] Moreover, wrongdoing turns the course of events aside from that straight way of righteousness in which they should go; they are set right by retribution. The nations robbed Israel of its land and wealth, and exacted service from the Chosen People; the land must be given back, the wealth of the Gentiles must be given to Israel, and the oppressors in their turn must serve those whom they oppressed.[2] The punishment of the wicked also manifests Yahweh's zeal for righteousness, and warns men to turn from their evil-doings. When the nations see His judgments they "know that He is Yahweh".[3] The wicked father dies on account of his sins, and his son "sees all his father's sins, which he hath done, and feareth,[4] and doeth not such like".[5] It is the duty of the "watchman" to warn the people of the fatal consequences of sin that they may turn from their iniquity and live.[6] The destruction of wicked nations purifies the world, and the cutting of sinners from Israel makes the people holy.[7]

Punishment, too, is a discipline by which God's chosen are purified. "Yahweh," we read, "in trouble have they visited Thee, they poured out a prayer when Thy chastening was upon them."[8] It is part of the complaint of the Second Isaiah against Israel that when it was "set on fire" and "burned" by the anger of God, the people

[1] Ezek. v. 5-15. [2] P. 279. [3] P. 30.
[4] R.V. mg. "Another reading is, *seeth*, or *considereth*".
[5] Ezek. xviii. 14. [6] Ezek. xxxiii. 1-9.
[7] Zech. xiv.; Mal. iv. 1-3. [8] Isa. xxvi. 16.

"laid it not to heart," *i.e.*, they did not recognise their sinfulness and repent. God refines and tries His people in the furnace of affliction.[1]

The teaching of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi implies that the punishments inflicted on the Jews for their neglect of the Temple were intended to lead them to repentance; and when Malachi declares that the Messenger of Yahweh shall "sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver,"[2] he refers to the discipline of chastisement.

The prophets, however, are so much occupied with the community that in considering such passages as we have cited it is difficult to know how far the purging consists of moral discipline, and how far it is wrought by cutting off sinners. The discipline of chastisement is most fully dealt with in the speeches of Elihu in *Job*.

One branch of the doctrine of retribution is so important that we must treat it separately, namely, the doctrine of Atonement, Reconciliation, Forgiveness, the restoration of the sinner to fellowship with God.

[1] Isa. xlii. 25, xlviii. 10. [2] Mal. iii. 3.

CHAPTER X.

ATONEMENT AND FINAL REPROBATION.

The problems connected with retribution are complicated by a factor we have hitherto ignored, namely, forgiveness. The Old Testament attitude towards this subject compels us to treat it in connexion with wider questions, already touched upon, but reserved for fuller treatment here. Sin, we have seen, separates man from God, and exposes him to the Divine anger; and it must always be remembered that the Old Testament, especially in the exilic and post-exilic prophets, does not emphasise, or perhaps even recognise, any distinction between "uncleanness" and what we should call sin.

The sinner, therefore, having incurred the Divine displeasure, two main questions arise: first, in what cases can the delinquent be restored to the favour of God? and, secondly, on what terms? Modern theology would say, when and how can he be forgiven? But there are cases of atonement, or restoration to Divine favour, in the Old Testament which do not include the element of forgiveness as we usually understand it.

It is convenient to consider first the cases in which there is no atonement; the offender is destroyed. Na-

tions seldom undergo this final penalty; a population would seldom be exterminated or removed to another country. Moreover, land and people were closely bound up together; the land would not disappear, and while it remained, it was difficult to think of the people as destroyed; especially when both country and nation bore the same name.[1]

Destruction.

But a sentence of complete and final ruin is pronounced against some nations. The post-exilic oracles against Babylon declare that "It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there; but wild beasts of the desert shall lie there".[2] The children are to be slain that the nation may not revive; Yahweh will cut off from Babylon "name and remnant, son and son's son".[3] "Babylon shall sink and not rise again."[4]

Similarly Edom is to be "a desolate wilderness"; if the Edomites attempt to rebuild their cities, Yahweh will throw them down, and they shall be known as "The people against whom Yahweh hath indignation for ever"; the whole people shall perish, and their land shall be occupied by the Jews of the South of Judah.[5]

Tyre is to be "a bare rock: thou shalt be a place for the spreading of nets; thou shalt be built no more . . . though thou be sought for, yet thou shalt never be found again".[6]

According to some passages a like doom awaited

[1] *Cf.* p. 241.
[2] Isa. xiii. 20 f.; similarly Jer. l. 39 f.
[3] Isa. xiv. 21 f.
[4] Jer. li. 64; *cf.* li. 37, 43, 62.
[5] Joel iii. 19; Mal. i. 4; Obad. 18 f.
[6] Ezek. xxvi. 14, 21; *cf.* xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19.

Ammon, Egypt and the Philistines ;[1] but elsewhere the ruin of these nations is not so complete.[2]

We are not expressly told why certain peoples should be treated with exceptional severity. We read much of their wickedness, but not how it was distinguished in kind or degree from that of other Gentile states. Nor are these passages history assuming the literary form of prediction, for they must be older than the period when utter desolation fell upon Babylon, Edom, and Tyre. One point, however, is clear; the standard is partly at any rate the behaviour of these nations towards Israel. Amongst the oppressors of the Chosen People, Babylon was the most recent, and seemed the harshest. Of their hostile neighbours, Edom was the most rancorous and troublesome.[3] The safety and prosperity of Israel, the vindication of its righteousness, demand the permanent extinction of its arch-enemies. A fuller knowledge of the history of the period might show that a similar explanation holds good for the case of Tyre. A principle of discrimination closely akin to the one suggested is found in the closing chapters of *Isaiah;* Yahweh declares to Israel, "That nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted".[4]

Experience might hinder men from anticipating the total extinction of a nation; but the premature death of an individual was an ordinary event of every-day life. It was obvious that there were sinners who found no place of repentance but were cut off in their iniquity.[5]

[1] Ezek. xxv. 7; Joel iii. 19; Obad. 19. [2] See below.

[3] *Cf.* p. 272. [4] Isa. lx. 12.

[5] For the moral difficulties involved in the view that premature death was a Divine judgment, see above, pp. 291 f.

Our prophets are chiefly concerned with the fate of different classes at some impending crisis when God shall judge His people. In this crisis some will be finally condemned and cut off. Thus Ezekiel in the last years of the monarchy predicts such a doom for the great majority of the people.[1] Later on he declares that before Israel is restored to its own land, God will purge out from them the stubborn rebels.[2] The later chapters of *Isaiah* reiterate the statement that "there is no peace unto the wicked"; and conclude with the picture of the carcases of the rebels against God devoured by undying worms, and consumed by a fire that is never quenched, "an abhorring unto all flesh".[3] In *Zechariah* the thief and the perjurer are "cut off,"[4] and in *Malachi* the same fate befals the man who marries a heathen woman; it also befals sorcerers, adulterers, perjurers; those who oppress the hireling, the widow, the fatherless, and the resident alien. When the day of Yahweh comes "it burns as a furnace, and all the proud and all that work wickedness shall be stubble, and the day that comes shall burn them up, saith Yahweh Çebāôth, so that it shall leave them neither root nor branch".[5]

[1] Ezek. vi. 8, viii., xiii.

[2] Ezek. xx. 38, E.V. "the rebels and them that transgress," *hammoredhim wehap-poshe'im;* the two words are synonyms, and the repetition emphasises the one idea; the phrase does not refer to two classes.

[3] Isa. xlviii. 22, lvii. 21, lxvi. 24.

[4] Zech. v. 3.

[5] Mal. ii. 12, iii. 5, iv. 1. It is not said in so many words that Yahweh will "cut off" the classes mentioned in iii. 5, only that He will be "a swift witness against them". But the context, the parallel passages, and the whole teaching of the book imply the cutting off of these men against whom Yahweh is "a swift witness".

Here again there is no exact statement of the kind or degree of wickedness which involves men in hopeless condemnation. When it is said that the adulterer and the man who marries a heathen woman are to be cut off, it is not meant that these sins cannot be forgiven under any circumstances. Each prophet selects for special condemnation the vices which were most harmful to the community in his own time; those who were found persisting in them in the Day of Yahweh would be cut off. Perhaps the followers of superstitious cults denounced in the closing chapters of *Isaiah* are the Samaritans[1] and their friends amongst the Jews, the most dangerous enemies of Revealed Religion in the period after the Return.

We have already suggested that men were shut out from forgiveness by a stubborn, rebellious persistence in sin, an unrepentant spirit; this is implied in several passages. The man who has received warning and does not turn from his wickedness, shall die in his iniquity.[2]

It is nowhere said in our prophets that a Gentile is shut out from forgiveness, simply because he is a Gentile.

Turning to the subject of Atonement, we may consider some of the leading terms involved. *Kippēr*[3] and its cognates are the most important group of words connected with the idea of atonement. In the cognate languages the root has the concrete meanings "cover" or "wipe off"; and is also used for technical terms connected with the

Terms for Atonement, etc.

[1] Isa. lvii., lxvi.; *cf.* pp. 103 ff. [2] Ezek. iii. 20; *cf.* xxxiii. 11, and below.

[3] כִּפֶּר. For a full discussion of this root, see J. Hermann, *Die Idee der Sühne im A.T.*; and for the complete treatment of the ritual of atonement, see the volume of this series on the Pentateuch.

ritual of atonement. There are a few passages in Hebrew where it is sometimes supposed to be used literally for "cover," and the ritual sense of "atone" is understood by many scholars as obtained from the figure of "covering". Others, however, explain this atoning as a "wiping off". The early history of the root is not of much importance for our period; it is not probable that the original etymology was in the minds of Ezekiel and his successors.[1]

We may illustrate the use of this root in our prophets. Isaiah xliii. 3 declares that Yahweh has given Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba as a *Kōpher* for Israel,[2] *i.e.*, Israel was the captive of Babylon; therefore when Cyrus conquered Babylon, Israel became his lawful possession, and Yahweh buys its liberty by presenting to Cyrus nations not part of the Chaldean Empire. *Kopher* here is a ransom, an equivalent offered to secure liberty for a captive. In Isaiah xxvii. 9 we read that the iniquity of Jacob shall be purged[3] on condition that the altars, Asherim, and sun-images are done away with.

Apart from these two passages the root only occurs in our prophets in *Ezekiel*, where it is commonly used of performance of ritual acts to cleanse the altar, the Temple or the people.[4] In one passage, however, it is used differently; we read of God "purging"[5] Jerusalem of all

[1] *Cf.* Hermann, and *B.D.B.*, *s.v.*

[2] Lit. as thy *Kopher*.

[3] *Yekuppar*, יְכֻפַּר.

[4] Ezek. xliii. 20, 26, xlv. 15, 17, 20.

[5] Ezek. xvi. 63, *bekapperi-lakh*, בְּכַפְּרִי־לָךְ; A.V., "when I am pacified toward thee;" R.V., "when I have forgiven thee". So also Hermann, p. 99; Kautzsch, *H.S.*; but H. P. Smith, p. 421, "purify," not "forgive".

that she has done; freeing her from the guilt and corruption of her sin.

The force of *kipper* and its cognates is much disputed. It is commonly explained from its supposed original sense of "cover," most frequently of the covering of sin; "so that its operation is hindered, its effects are invalidated . . . so that the eyes of Jehovah do not behold it, and His anger against it is quenched".[1] Ritschl, however, holds that *kipper* denotes, not the covering of sin, but the covering of the worshipper from the deadly effect of the majesty of the Divine Presence. Men cannot see God and live; men cannot enter the sanctuary of Yahweh safely unless they are protected by suitable ritual. This view has not been widely accepted.[2]

It is also held that the use of the verb *kipper* is controlled by that of the noun *kopher*. "The noun is a payment or gift in settlement of a claim," as in Isaiah xliii. 3, and "the verb is to make such a payment". *Kopher* is properly blood money or compensation for homicide.[3] This usage is sometimes derived from the supposed original sense of "wipe out"; first "wipe out," then "compensate," then "appease," then "purify from ritual defilement" with or, when God is the subject, without ritual offerings.[4]

Another term, *ḥiṭṭe'*, to purify from sin, R.V. "cleanse," is used by Ezekiel as a synonym for *kipper*, of cleansing the altar and the sanctuary.[5]

[1] *A.B.D.*, p. 320 f. [2] Hermann, p. 15; Köberle.
[3] H. P. Smith, pp. 412, 415; similarly Hermann.
[4] H. P. Smith, p. 422.

[5] חִטֵּא, Ezek. xliii. 20, 22, 23, xlv. 18; elsewhere it may be a denominative from *hatt'ath*, "sin-offering," "to offer a sin-offering"; in

Forgiveness is denoted by a number of terms, most of them more or less figurative. *Ṣālaḥ*,[1] R.V. "forgive, pardon," is perhaps connected with "send away".[2] Yahweh also "takes away iniquity or guilt,"[3] and "passes over[4] or overlooks"; and "blots out"[5] transgressions; and does not remember[6] them. In Isaiah xl.-lxvi. God is often spoken of as the "Redeemer," *i.e.*, one who intervenes on behalf of a friend or kinsman.[7]

God willing to Forgive.

The passages just referred to suggest that God is anxious to forgive. Though He is just, and condemns and punishes sin; yet He desires reconciliation rather than satisfaction; an attitude that is summed up in the words of Ezekiel: "As I live, saith the Lord Yahweh, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but (rather desire) that the wicked turn from his way and live".[8] Thus Dillmann,[9] "The objective ground of all forgiveness is . . . simply the Divine sympathy with weak man, God's grace and truth". Thus the Second Isaiah describes God's attitude to Israel

Ezekiel it seems to be privative, "to do away with sin"; or the usage might be derived either in all cases from the denominative sense, or in all cases from the privative.

[1] Isa. lv. 7; Jer. l. 20, סלח, only used of God.

[2] שלח, *shālaḥ*. [3] Mic. vii. 18, נשא עון, *nāsā' 'āwôn*.

[4] Mic. vii. 18, עבר, *'ābhar*.

[5] Isa. xliii. 25, xliv. 22, מחה, *māḥâ*,

[6] Isa. xliii. 25; Ezek. xxxiii. 16.

[7] The root commonly used is גאל, *gā'al* (*cf.* p. 137) occasionally פדה, *pādâ*, "ransom," *e.g.*, Isa. xxxv. 10, l. 2; Zech. x. 8. For Isa. xl. 2, R.V. "her iniquity is pardoned," see pp. 305 f.

[8] Ezek. xxxiii. 11; *cf.* xviii. 23-32. [9] P. 471.

as that of a loving husband towards the "wife of his youth," whom he has been compelled to abandon for a time; he is eager to recall her to his home at the first possible moment.[1]

Thus forgiveness is thought of as a spontaneous act of God, and, as Hermann says, "Ezekiel separates the idea of Divine forgiveness from the necessity of human service".[2] Thus he uses *kipper* practically in the sense of "forgive".[3] Similarly Second Isaiah offers forgiveness as a free gift: "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat".[4] It is the thought of human need and weakness that moves God to forgive: "I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirits should fail before Me, and the souls that I have made".[5] Free grace, seeking reconciliation with man, is implied in the lavish promises which God makes to the exiles. Yahweh describes Himself as continually planning and working for the deliverance of Israel; waiting to pour out blessings upon them.[6] The forgiving grace of Yahweh shows itself in the redemption and deliverance of His people.[7] It is the unique glory of Yahweh that He delights in loving-kindness, so that He does not nurse His wrath, but turns from it, and pardons His people.[8] The same attitude is seen in Zechariah's account of the purification of the High Priest Joshua. Yahweh has to be

[1] Isa. liv. 6-8.

[2] *Leistung*, apparently used in the sense of *opus operatum*, p. 59; *cf.* pp. 30, 58, 99.

[3] Ezek. xvi. 63; so R.V.

[4] Isa. lv. 1.

[5] Isa. lvii. 16.

[6] Isa. xliv., etc.

[7] Koberle, p. 236.

[8] Mic. vii. 18 f.

reminded by Satan of the sin of Joshua; He listens reluctantly, and rebukes Satan for his anxiety that the High Priest should be punished; He causes his iniquity to pass away from him; and later on declares that He will remove the iniquity of the land in one day. There is no reference to any conditions which God feels to be necessary before He can forgive.[1] Again, in Isaiah xxvii. 4 f., Yahweh declares "Fury is not in Me . . . let him take hold of My strength and make peace with Me". It is not God's resentment but man's reluctance which hinders reconciliation.

If in general God is moved to forgive by man's frailty and the essential benevolence of His own nature, there are additional reasons why He should be merciful to Israel. He is the Kinsman,[2] Creator, Father and Husband of the people, which He made His own by a Divine Election, and bound to Himself by solemn Covenants. How can He forsake them? It is, as the Second Isaiah puts it, part of the Divine Righteousness that He should remain faithful to Israel, even when Israel is faithless to Him. In spite of their sin He intervenes to save them and to reconcile them to Himself "for His Name's sake".[3] The great goodness of Yahweh to Israel in the past is made the ground of appeals for renewed forgiveness.[4]

The spontaneous character of forgiveness as a free act of God is most strikingly shown by the fact that forgiveness is sometimes thought of as the antecedent and cause of repentance and amendment. Thus according to Eze-

[1] Zech. iii. [2] *Go'el*, E.V. "Redeemer"; see p. 137.
[3] Isa. xli. 8 ff., li. 5; *cf.* above, pp. 30 f. [4] Isa. lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12.

kiel men amend their lives because God gives them a new heart and a new spirit; and the Israelites remember their evil ways and wicked doings, and loathe themselves, after God has forgiven and delivered them.[1] Second Isaiah, too, urges men to "return unto God," *i.e.*, to repent and amend, because He has blotted out their sins and redeemed them.[2] Similarly in Zechariah xii., after God has intervened to deliver Jerusalem and has poured out upon the people the spirit of grace and supplication, they are moved to mourn for their sins.

Naturally comparatively little is said about God's desire that the Gentiles should be reconciled to Him, but there is enough to show that His willingness to forgive was not limited to Israel. Restoration is promised to Moab, Ammon and Elam;[3] Egypt is to be delivered when its people cry to Yahweh.[4] God appeals to all the ends of the earth to look unto Him and be saved;[5] and the example of Nineveh shows that the penitent Gentile may expect forgiveness, though the attitude of Jonah shows that this was not the view commonly held amongst the Jews.

Atonement by Punishment.

In popular theology sin is often thought of as a debt which may be paid or an injury for which compensation may be made. Punishment becomes restitution, repayment, or compensation. When punishment has been endured the account is settled; "atonement" has been made; the wrongdoer is reconciled to his victim, to the offended law, or to God. This view is often found in the Old Testa-

[1] Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 24-32. [2] Isa. xliv. 22.
[3] Jer. xlviii. 47, xlix. 6, 39; probably post-exilic.
[4] Isa. xix. 20. [5] Isa. xlv. 22.

ment; it is followed in many of the civil and criminal laws of the Pentateuch, and to a certain extent in the sacrificial ritual. In such transactions there is, properly speaking, no forgiveness. This principle is specially illustrated by teaching concerning Israel as a community. Thus, towards the close of the Exile, Jerusalem is encouraged to take comfort and believe that she is reconciled to God because "she had received at the hand of Yahweh double for all her sins".[1] Allowance must be made for hyperbolical rhetoric, but the idea is certainly implied that punishment purged the nation of sin. Elsewhere the oppressors of Israel are rebuked because their cruelty had gone beyond the measure of punishment which Yahweh had intended to inflict.[2]

But reconciliation through punishment is more often found in cases where the covenant-relation of Israel with Yahweh has been interfered with by the sins of individuals. The punishment of the sinners or their representatives by their exclusion from the community or their death, appeases the wrath of Yahweh. Thus in the time of Joshua, the renewed favour of Yahweh was obtained for Israel by the execution of Achan; and in the time of David, the slaughter of Saul's descendants removed the Divine curse inflicted on account of Saul's sin.[3] So in the prophets of our period, one necessary antecedent of the full reconciliation of God to Israel is the destruction of sinners. Before Jerusalem is completely re-established as the sanctuary of Yahweh, He manifests His anger with fire and sword, "and the slain of Yahweh shall be many".[4] Before Israel can be restored to the Holy Land, the rebels

[1] Isa. xl. 2.
[2] Isa. xlvii. 6, 7.
[3] Josh. vii., viii.; 2 Sam. xxi.
[4] Isa. lxvi. 16.

must be cut off from the people.[1] Later on the Divine curse falls upon evil-doers and purges the land of them; again, Yahweh cuts off two-thirds of the people; and again, He burns up the wicked.[2]

From the point of view of the community, these judgments are in one aspect a purification; but they are also a punishment, by which Divine justice is satisfied, and God is reconciled to His people.

We have reserved for special comment the incident in Numbers xxv., because in connexion with it the principle we are dealing with has been challenged by Hermann.[3] The anger of Yahweh was kindled because Israel was seduced by Moab into immorality and the worship of false gods. The actual culprits were slain; last of all a noble who had openly taken a Midianitess to his tent. Then the wrath of Yahweh was appeased; apparently a case of atonement by punishment. The sin of individual Israelites is the sin of Israel; their punishment is the punishment of the nation. Hermann maintains that Yahweh was not appeased by punishment, but by the righteous zeal of Phinehas who slew the Midianitess and her consort. He would probably extend this explanation to some of the passages dealt with above. The ground of his objection is that, according to the priestly writer, Yahweh declared that "Phinehas . . . the priest hath turned away My wrath from the children of Israel, in that he was zealous with My zeal". On the strength of this, Hermann declares that the priestly writer says plainly that the atonement was not made by the punishment of the culprits. This is hardly correct; all he says is that

[1] Ezek. xx. 38. [2] Zech. v. 3, xiii. 8; Mal. iv. 1.
[3] P. 70.

the atonement was brought about by the zeal of Phinehas, *i.e.*, by that which his zeal accomplished, the chastisement of conspicuous sinners, completing the penalty required by God. Similarly we read that the wicked shall be a means of atonement, *kopher*,[1] for the righteous; and the transgressor for the upright.

Conditions of Forgiveness.

We may now turn to forgiveness in the strict sense, reconciliation without the infliction of the full penalty which God might have required. We will enumerate the various acts and qualities which are spoken of in our documents as conditions or means of forgiveness, before dealing with these conditions in detail. They are as follows—repentance and amendment; faith; the restoration of ceremonial cleanness and holiness; the intercession of holy men; fasting and the performance of sacrifices and other ritual; the vicarious suffering of the innocent. It will be obvious that we must not think of any one prophet as combining all these conditions in an exact theory of redemption; some of them would be only alternative or occasional, as, for instance, the intercession of the righteous. But, on the other hand, the fact that a single passage or book only mentions one or two of these conditions, would not warrant us in concluding that the author held that these alone were necessary. Even the most original teacher has a number of presuppositions, common to himself and his audience, which he expects to be taken for granted, and does not think it necessary to specify. He confines himself to the doctrines which he wishes to emphasise. He may speak only of repentance, and yet assume that the customary ritual acts would be performed.

[1] E.V. "ransom," Prov. xxi. 18.

If God's willingness to forgive is to issue in reconciliation between Him and sinners, men must repent and amend their lives. Amendment is the objective manifestation of the subjective penitence. In the struggle of motives for the control of conduct, the inner feeling may not always reveal itself to human eyes in outward act; but the inspired writers recognise no penitence which does not cripple a man's evil energies and reinforce his efforts after practical righteousness. The idea of repentance is usually expressed by saying that the sinner "turns from the evil of his ways," or simply "turns," and such "turning" is associated with doing that which is right.[1] Repentance involves acknowledgment and confession of and shame for sin. The unrepentant sinner usually persuades himself that his evil courses are right: "The ways of a man are clean in his own eyes".[2] The first step towards reconciliation with God is a man's own recognition that he is in the wrong, that he is a sinner; or, to use the evangelical phrase, "conviction of sin". The erring nation, like the individual sinner, plumes itself upon its righteousness; and it is one important task of the prophets "to bring home to My people their transgressions, and to the house of Jacob their sins"; Malachi, especially, has to wrestle with the self-righteousness of his contemporaries.[3] A man's recognition of his sinfulness necessarily involves confession to God; such recognition and confes-

Repentance and Amendment.

[1] Ezek. xxxiii. 11-19. "Turn" = שׁוּב, *shûbh*. The other root, translated "repent" in E.V., נחם, *nḥm*, = change of purpose; it is chiefly used of God.

[2] Prov. xvi. 2.

[3] Isa. lviii. 1-4; Mal. iii. 7-12, etc.

sion are only two aspects of one mental act. Confession before men, in a certain sense, is also involved; not that the sinner furnishes his fellows with a detailed schedule of his evil deeds; but that his changed life and language imply, at any rate, a condemnation of his former conduct. Public confession was naturally made of national sin; and the prophets are often the mouthpieces of such confession.

Thus the confession of Israel in the last days of the Monarchy, "Our transgressions and our sins are upon us, and we pine away in them; how then should we live," precedes God's offer of forgiveness. But the tenor of this offer indicates the necessity of guarding against a certain ambiguity. God does not accept these words as a sign of genuine penitence; He demands repentance, and implies that the Israelites are bringing judgment on themselves by persisting in sin: "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" It was possible to believe that conduct was sinful in the eyes of God, and to desire to escape from Divine chastisement, and yet to hold that God not the sinner was at fault: "Ye say, O house of Israel, the way of the Lord is not equal".[1] There was no true repentance. Then, as now, a man might acknowledge sin, and instead of regarding it as evil might think and speak of it with a certain pride. The real "conviction of sin" makes sin an evil thing to the man himself.

Elsewhere, however, we have a more genuine confession; in the Exile, Israel declares "we have sinned"; later on similar confessions preface appeals for forgive-

[1] Ezek. xxxiii. 10-20.

ness, *e.g.*, "all our righteousnesses are as filthy garments".[1]

Contrition also produces shame. The exiles are addressed thus, with reference to their future penitence and restoration: "Then shall ye remember your evil ways, and your doings that were not good; and ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities and for your abominations". We often read that sinners shall be ashamed and confounded; it is true that as a rule this refers to the confusion into which men are thrown by God's chastisements, yet it also describes a feature in the penitence of the man who humbles himself before God. Thus Ezekiel bids Israel be ashamed of all its iniquities; and it is only on condition that Israel does show itself ashamed, that he is allowed to communicate to the people the revelation he has received as to the plans for the restored Temple.[2]

The combination of penitence and amendment as conditions for forgiveness are well set forth in an exilic passage: "Let the ungodly forsake his way, and the wicked man his thoughts, and let him turn to Yahweh, and He will have compassion on him, and to our God for He will abundantly pardon".[3] For though the word rendered "thoughts" is rather "plan," "device," or "purpose,"[4] yet purposes belong on their subjective side to the inner life, and a wholesale change of purposes involves a moral revolution. Later on we read that "the

[1] Isa. xlvi. 24, lix. 12, lxiv. 5.

[2] Ezek. xxxvi. 22, xliii. 10, 11.

[3] Isa. lv. 7, *P.B.* Cheyne, however, regards the verse as a post-exilic gloss.

[4] מַחְשְׁבָה, *maḥăshābhâ.*

High and Lofty One" abides "with him who is crushed and lowly in spirit, to revive the spirit of the lowly, and to revive the heart of those who are crushed".[1] It is true that these "expressions do not necessarily imply what we mean by contrition—the crushing effect of remorse for sin—but only the subdued, self-distrusting spirit which is produced by affliction".[2] Nevertheless the verse illustrates the necessity of a right attitude of the inner life as a condition of restoration to full fellowship with God. Joel insists on the necessity of a change in the inner attitude by using the figure "rend your hearts and not your garments".[3]

The prophets as practical preachers lay stress on the necessity of reformation in conduct as a condition of reconciliation to God. Ezekiel is preoccupied with this idea; in the celebrated eighteenth chapter and the parallel passage xxxiii. 10-16, he conveys the impression that amendment has an immediate, complete, and almost magical effect; he says of the man who reforms, "He shall surely live, he shall not die. None of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him." Reformation, however, must not altogether ignore the past; the wicked man must, as far as possible, undo the consequences of his wrong-doing, and make compensation for the injuries he has inflicted; he must "restore the pledge, and give back his plunder".[4] The author of Isaiah xl.-lv. was absorbed in his special mission to

[1] Isa. lvii. 15, *P.B.*; "crushed," נִדְכָּא, *nidhkâ*, pass. of דכא, "crush," and the synonymous adj. דַּכָּא, *dakka*; E.V. "contrite".

[2] Skinner, *C.B.S.* [3] Joel ii. 12 f.

[4] Ezek. xxxiii. 15 f.

comfort and encourage the Jews, and to confirm and develop their faith in Yahweh, so that he does not dwell on the necessity of amendment.[1] But the subject is conspicuous in his successors. Post-exilic writers told the Jews that if they wished to be restored to God's favour they must be just and generous, release the oppressed, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, provide shelter for the homeless, keep the Sabbath, rebuild the Temple, maintain the worship of Yahweh.[2] Elsewhere[3] it is said that the iniquity of Jacob shall be purged[4] when all the paraphernalia of superstition, altars, *asherim*, and sun-images[5] are destroyed. Again, the conditions of forgiveness are justice, benevolence, and reverent submission to God.[6]

At the same time, it must not be supposed that God's willingness to forgive arises from the reformation of Israel or of the sinner. As we have seen already, God is anxious to forgive, and it is in response to His gracious solicitations and through the prevailing influence of His spirit that man is won to penitence and amendment. But clearly God does not receive to His favour those who are persisting in disobedience and ill-will towards Him.[7]

Sacrifices.

The prophets from Ezekiel onwards for the most part recognise the sacrificial ritual as an antecedent or accompaniment of the restoration of Israel to full fellowship with Yahweh; while, as our previous section has shown, they are even more insistent on

[1] *Cf.*, however, Isa. lv. 6.
[2] Isa. lviii.; Hag. ii. 18 f.; Zech. viii. 9 ff.; Mal. iii. 10 ff.
[3] Isa. xx vii. 9.
[4] *Yekuppar.* [5] חַמָּנִים *ḥammanim.*
[6] Mic. vi. 8. [7] P. 299.

the moral conditions of reconciliation.[1] Still, they are not as explicit as their pre-exilic predecessors on the relations between ritual and the inner life, and do not lay so much emphasis on the uselessness of sacrifices apart from justice, benevolence and faith.

Naturally it is the priest Ezekiel who has most to say about sacrifices. In the concluding section of his book, we meet with the whole range of sacrifices: *ʿōlâ*, "whole burnt-offering,"[2] *ḥaṭṭāʾth*, "sin-offering,"[3] *ʾāshām*, "trespass-offering" or "guilt-offering,"[4] *minḥâ*, "meal-offering,"[5] *shelem*, "peace-offering".[6] In all his references to these rites, he seems to be referring to familiar institutions of long standing. Apparently he did not introduce any new sacrifices; he did not propose any sweeping changes in the mode of offering the sacrifices; nor did he suggest any fundamentally new interpretation of them. These positions are not universally held, though a careful weighing of statements which seem opposed suggests that the difference is often one of form and not of substance. Hermann and Schmoller, however, regard the *hattath* and *asham* in Ezekiel as novelties. Schmoller holds that the exilic reformation sanctioned, purified and developed the chief elements of the ancient ritual, and by no means wholly reconstituted the form of Divine worship; but yet it introduced two new forms of sacrifice, the *asham* and *hattath*, which are distinguished from the other sacrifices by characteristic rites.[7] Hermann main-

[1] *Cf.* Köberle, p. 312. For the full discussion of the sacrifices, see the volume on the Pentateuch.

[2] עֹלָה. [3] חַטָּאת. [4] אָשָׁם.

[5] מִנְחָה. [6] שֶׁלֶם. Ezek. xl. 39, xlii. 13, xliii. 27, etc.

[7] See Hermann, p. 30.

tains that atoning sacrifices[1] in the strict sense, sacrifices such as *hattath* and *asham*, which as their name implies were intended to set aside the guilt of specific sins, did not exist before the time of Ezekiel and the Priestly Code. According to him, the sense of sin in Israel was greatly deepened by the Fall of Jerusalem and the Exile; it was felt that the current ritual of atonement was inadequate, and therefore new forms were devised.[2] Piepenbring makes the more guarded statement that there is never in the old documents any reference to a special class of expiatory sacrifices.[3] This is probably true, for in Hosea iv. 8 *hattath* is rather sin than sin-offering.

These expressions must not be understood to mean that the *hattath* and *asham* were absolute novelties. The words, of course, are older than the Exile; but in the course of centuries they had undergone a change of meaning. In Ezekiel and the Priestly Code *asham* and *hattath* are sacrifices, but in earlier times one or both words denoted money compensation. When the Philistines returned the Ark, they sent with it gifts of gold by way of *asham*. We also read of *asham* silver and *hattath* silver.[4] Moreover, the *hattath* and *asham* are entirely absent from the many passages referring to sacrifices in the prophets of the eighth century and even in *Jeremiah*. But the transition from compensation—in money or kind—to sacrifices would be easy; sacrifices would naturally be associated with the payment of compensation. Sometimes the settlement of a claim would be celebrated by a feast, which would involve a sacrifice. Then there would

[1] *Sühnopfer*. [2] Hermann, pp. 102, 108.
[3] P. 308. [4] 1 Sam. vi. 3, etc.; 2 Kings xii. 16.

be cases of compensation to God, to the Temple or the priesthood, and here again there would be sacrifices; and thus the priests, emphasising the ritual element of the transaction came to speak of such sacrifices as *hattath* or *asham*. But the terms may not have been thus used in common speech till the priest Ezekiel and the priestly authors of the Law of Holiness published their ritual codes. The usage and nomenclature we are discussing probably arose towards the close of the Jewish monarchy. In Isaiah liii. 10 *asham* is used figuratively.[1]

The distinction between *hattath* and *asham* is not very clear. Sometimes the texts seem to treat the words as two names for the same sacrifice, sometimes they seem to recognise a difference; but we are not concerned here with this question.[2] Ezekiel does not help to solve it; except so far as his use of the two words side by side in such phrases as "to slay thereon the *old* and the *hattath* and the *asham*"[3] implies that they denoted two distinct sacrifices. Ezekiel simply mentions the *asham*, four times, always coupled with *hattath;* he gives no account of its ritual, its significance, or the occasions on which it was to be offered. We are told, however, that the *asham*, like the *hattath*, was included among the "holies of holies," or "most holy things," which were to be eaten by the priests; that both were to be prepared for eating by boiling; and that their "sanctity" was so contagious, that they were not to be brought into the outer court of the Temple, lest they should "sanctify" the people. In other words, if a layman touched the flesh of one of these sacrifices, he would become in some way consecrated to

[1] *Cf.* p. 57. [2] Note 1, p. 314.
[3] Ezek. xl. 39, xlii. 13, xliv. 29, xlvi. 20.

the Temple, and would only be released on payment of some fine or performance of certain rites.[1] It is noteworthy that the list of sacrifices which the prince has to provide includes *ola*, *shelem* and *hattath*, but not *asham*.

There might be more reason for supposing that Ezekiel introduced some modifications in connexion with the *hattath*. He directs that a series of *hattath's*, young bullocks and he-goats, shall be offered in connexion with the dedication of the altar in the new Temple, and on the two days of Atonement.[2] In each case the blood of the sacrifice is to be placed on certain parts of the altar and the Temple respectively; the *hattath* is to be burnt in an appointed place outside the sanctuary.[3] It is clear that only a part of the ritual is specified, the rest is taken for granted. What is given agrees with the Priestly Code, except in some details as to the manipulation of the blood.[4]

Besides special arrangements for feasts and Sabbaths, Ezekiel provides for a daily burnt-offering of a lamb, to be offered every morning.[5] We should expect to find a daily sacrifice as part of the ritual of any important

[1] Ezek. xl. 39, xlii. 13, xliv. 29, xlvi. 20. [2] See p. 22.

[3] Ezek. xliii. 19 ff., xlv. 17.

[4] Lev. iv., etc. It is not quite clear how we are to reconcile the statement in Ezek. xliii. 21, that the carcase of the *hattath* was burnt, with xliv. 29, xlvi. 20, which state that the flesh was boiled and eaten by the priests. A similar apparent inconsistency exists between certain passages of the Priestly Code. Perhaps only part of the flesh was eaten and the rest burnt; or the usage may have varied on different occasions. Here again Ezekiel takes for granted a knowledge of known customs.

[5] Ezek. xlvi. 13, 15, the *tāmîdh*, תָּמִיד, of the later ritual.

sanctuary, so that here Ezekiel is probably perpetuating ancient custom. But, as he makes it the subject of an express ordinance, and does not take it for granted, we may conclude that no special importance attached to the unbroken continuity of this sacrifice in early times. In the Priestly Code[1] there were two daily sacrifices, morning and evening; forming an essential feature of the ritual.[2]

Ezekiel and Isaiah lvi.-lxvi. show that superstitions or irregular sacrifices continued during and after the Exile. Sometimes these were offered to false gods, in other cases they were offered to Yahweh, but repudiated by those who wrote in the name of the official cult. These illegitimate rites were partly a reversion to the old worship of the high-places.[3] But even in the Temple itself things were not always done "decently and in order";[4] though, probably, after the reforms of Nehemiah, nothing but absolute necessity was allowed to interfere with the regular routine.[5]

In *Jonah* the heathen sailors offer on shipboard a sacrifice to Yahweh,[6] and we are evidently meant to understand that this was acceptable and praiseworthy. In *Malachi*[7] Yahweh speaks with approval of the incense and offerings presented to him by the Gentiles; but the use of the word "offering" excludes the sacrifices proper, as "offering" or *minhâ* in the later literature is confined to the bloodless offering.

In Ezekiel's miniature apocalypse of Gog and Magog, the slaughter of the Gentile hordes on the mountains of

[1] Exod. xxix. 38.
[2] Dan. viii. 11.
[3] Isa. lvii. 7, lxv. 3, lxvi. 3; Ezek. xiv. 1, xxx. 20 ff.
[4] Mal. i. 8-14.
[5] Joel i. 9, 13, ii. 14; Dan. viii. 11.
[6] Jonah i. 16.
[7] Mal. i. 11.

Israel is spoken of as a sacrifice of Yahweh. The carrion birds and the beasts of prey are invited to assemble and partake of this holocaust," till, saith the Lord Yahweh, ye shall be filled at my table ".[1]

We may ask next what the prophets believed to be effected by sacrifices. Piepenbring[2] sums up the uses of sacrifice thus : " Sacrifices have the same object as any other offering made to Jehovah,—to obtain or retain His favours, or to render thanks for favours obtained," a summary which may be adopted with a measure of amplification and interpretation. We have already[3] pointed out that the maintenance of the sacrificial routine is part of the normal relation, the due fellowship between Yahweh and Israel. This is further implied in the anxiety shown by Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi and Joel that the routine should be properly observed. Malachi explains the misfortunes of his times by the wrath of God excited by meagre offerings of unsatisfactory victims ;[4] and Joel sees in the impossibility of providing meal-offerings and drink-offerings, mere adjuncts of the sacrifices proper, sufficient occasion for night-long lamentation on the part of the priests.[5] Interruption of the routine or its unworthy performance affected devout Jews as an interdict

Efficacy of Sacrifices.

[1] Ezek. xxxix. 17 ff. Ezekiel shares with the Priestly Code the substitution of קָרְבָּן, *Qorban*, for *minhâ* as general offering, and the limitation of the latter to bloodless offerings; also the use of תְּרוּמָה, *terûmâ*, " heave-offering," for special kinds of offerings; *cf.* Mal. iii. 8.

[2] P. 61. [3] Pp. 250 f. [4] Mal. i., iii.

[5] Joel i. 13.

did the pious Christians in the Middle Ages. The citizen of Jerusalem without sacrifices felt more lost than the modern Protestant feels when his usual place of worship is closed, and he cannot hear his favourite preacher; and if the ritual were not properly carried out, the pious worshipper at the Temple was even more distressed than a devout Anglican at a slovenly administration of the Eucharist. The ancient Jew had a vague dread of material calamity or other Divine judgment as the consequence of such lapses.

On the other hand, when proselytes are admitted to the privileges of true believers, it is said that their burnt-offerings and sacrifices shall be accepted upon the altar of Yahweh.[1] Doubtless, too, as Stade points out,[2] many Jews who had little interest in spiritual matters felt, nevertheless, that "it was prudent and expedient to safeguard their material wealth by taking part in sacrifices". Even for the more spiritually minded, sacrifices seemed necessary to any satisfactory religious life, so that pictures of the ideal future still include sacrificial worship.[3] It was left for the Christian Apocalypse to imagine a Holy City without a Temple.[4]

As sacrifice was a normal condition of fellowship with God, the efficacy of sacrifice depended upon the observance of the ordinances of the legitimate ritual. The superstitious sacrifices at the high places, or the imperfect performance of the Temple sacrifices, not only failed to win blessing, but called down the anger of Yahweh upon the worshippers. But, as we have seen, *Jonah* and

[1] Isa. lvi. 7. [2] P. 330. [3] *Cf.* ch. vii.
[4] Rev. xxi. 22, but *cf.* p. 112.

Malachi imply that heathen sacrifices and offerings may sometimes be acceptable.[1]

Thus failure or error in ritual might disturb the fellowship between Israel and Yahweh; but this is only a special example of the principle that such disturbance was caused by sin. Sacrifices are constantly associated with the renewal of fellowship, with atonement or reconciliation with God; they are spoken of as effecting *kāpara*.[2] From the context we gather that when this is accomplished, all is well between God and His people.

It is well known that only venial sins could be thus atoned for,[3] at any rate according to the theory of the Priestly Code. Those who sinned with a "high hand" were "cut off".[4] This view of the limited efficacy of sacrifice is older than the Priestly Code; we are told that the iniquity of Eli's family could never be atoned for by sacrifice or offering;[5] and the narrative of the classical instance of atonement, the forgiveness of David after the murder of Uriah, makes no mention of sacrifice. Ezekiel shares this view; the sin-offerings of his two Days of Atonement are made "for every one that erreth, and for him that is simple";[6] and we have seen that in Ezekiel and elsewhere heinous sin is punished by the destruction of the offenders; such destruction is a festal sacrifice

[1] *Cf.* p. 101.

[2] כַּפָּרָה, a post-biblical word; the Old Testament uses the verb, but it is convenient, with Hermann and others, to use the noun for the effect of the action denoted by the verb *kipper* in Ezek. xliii. 20, etc.

[3] *Cf.* p. 266.

[4] *E.g.*, Dillmann, pp. 466 f.; Lev. iv. 2, v. 1-5, xxii. 14; Num. xv. 24-30.

[5] 1 Sam. iii. 14. [6] Ezek. xlv. 20.

which Yahweh celebrates. Similarly, the sins mostly referred to in connexion with sacrifices have to do with the ritual and the sanctuary. Thus the *hattath* or sin-offering is offered in order to purge from sin, "cleanse,"[1] the altar at its consecration, and the temple on the two Days of Atonement. Similarly, when a house was pronounced free of leprosy, atonement was made by killing a bird and other rites.[2] By the limitation of the efficacy of sacrifice to ritual and venial sins, the Priestly Code implied that only such sins could be forgiven, and that only such sins were committed by Jews who were and remained members of the "Congregation," the true Israel—a theory not unlike that sometimes propounded as to converted Christians. It was impossible to apply the theory honestly in practical life, and any attempt to do so must have given rise to much casuistry. The admonition, "Say not before the *mal'akh* (*i.e.*, probably priest) it was an error,"[3] may illustrate a practice of obtaining ritual atonement for serious offences on the pretext that they were "errors".

The Priestly Code, like Ezekiel, may have partly contemplated an ideal community. In practical life stress would be laid on the value of sacrifices as a means of *kappara* or reconciliation; the limitation would often be forgotten; and the ritual would be thought of as atoning for sins generally.[4] This habit of thought may be illustrated by the statement that on the Day of Atonement the High Priest was "to effect *kappara* for the sanctuary, because of the uncleannesses of the Israelites, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins".[5]

[1] חַטָּאת, *ḥittai*. [2] Lev. xiv. 53.

[3] Eccles. v. 6; Hermann, p. 97. [4] *Cf.* Hermann, pp. 108 f.

[5] Lev. xvi. 16. Properly understood, this ordinance is not inconsistent with the general theory of the Priestly Code. It is not said

The importance attached to the Day of Atonement in later Judaism shows that the effect of its ritual was not supposed to be confined to venial offences.

Ezekiel does not throw much light on the special efficacy of the different sacrifices; but in connexion with the subject we are discussing we may note that the power of effecting *kappara* or reconciliation is not confined to the *hattath* and the *asham,* but is possessed by all the sacrifices. Thus the *minha, olà* and *shelem* are said to effect *kapparà*—without any mention of *hattath* or *asham.*[1] Similarly in the Priestly Code *kapparà* may be effected apart from *hattath* or *asham,* by the payment of money, by *ola,* by the application of oil (associated, however, with *asham*), and in other ways.[2] The *hattath* is specially connected with the ritual efficiency of the altar and the Temple.

Theory of Sacrifice.

The Old Testament has no theory of sacrifice; as Piepenbring says, "it does not explain just how atonement is effected".[3] The prophets and lawgivers did not invent sacrifices; they found them existing as part of the normal religious life of the people. The ritual is partly an inheritance from the primitive Semites; partly due to the influence of Egypt, Babylon, and still more of Canaan; partly the re-

that *kappara* is made for all sins, but only for the sanctuary. The sinner might be cut off, but the effect of his sin on the community and the Temple had to be further purged by due ritual. Nevertheless, according to popular interpretation, the *kappara* referred to would be extended to individual sinners.

[1] Ezek. xlv. 15; *cf.* verse 17, where the *hattath, minha, ola* and *shelem* are mentioned together as effecting *kappara.*

[2] Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. i. 4, xiv. 29, 53. [3] P. 314.

sult of the reforming zeal of the inspired leaders and teachers of Israel.[1] Most priests would be as little interested in any theory of sacrifice as a modern choir-leader in the question why anthems are pleasing to the Almighty. As a rule, theories as to the meaning of ritual only rise after the origin of the rites has been forgotten, and are apt to represent the speculations of theologians rather than the faith and emotion of the worshippers.[2] Sacrifices, like almsgiving and other such religious acts, were a natural expression of gratitude, affection, or fear; and involved more or less consciously the idea that God was gratified by gifts, and that thus His favour could be purchased and His wrath appeased; a primitive theology possessed of great vitality. Its influence may be clearly traced, as we have seen, in the post-exilic prophets.[3] The killing and burning of animals or other food and the pouring out of libations seemed a way of conveying such gifts to God; when part was burnt, and part eaten by worshippers, they felt united with their deity in the fellowship of a common meal.[4] A victim or part of it might become a gift to God by being bestowed upon His representatives, the priests.

If reasons were asked for sacrificing according to some specific ritual, it would be sufficient to reply that it was so ordained of God. Thus Ezekiel, like the Pentateuch, claims Divine authority for the laws he promulgates: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh".[5]

We are indeed told in the Priestly Code that "the

[1] Hermann, pp. 103 ff.
[2] *Cf.* H. Fielding, *Hearts of Men*, p. 120. [3] See pp. 77 f.
[4] Ezek. xliv. 7, "my bread, the fat and the blood".
[5] Ezek. xlv. 18.

blood makes atonement because of the life,"[1] because "the life of the flesh is in the blood".[2] Of which passage Davidson well says:[3] "As to the principle of atonement by the sacrifice or the blood of sacrifice, this, I fear, must remain obscure. The law nowhere appears to give any rationale or explanation of the ordinance that blood atones or covers the sin or defilement. The passage in Leviticus xvii. 11 comes nearest to explanation, though without supplying it." Indeed, so far as the passage offers any explanation it seems to lie in the middle clause of the verse, "I (Yahweh) have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your lives"—another application of the principle just referred to; the blood atones because God has appointed that it should atone. Ezekiel illustrates the idea of the atoning quality of blood, by the prominence he gives to the manipulation of blood in the *hattath* ritual. The fact that blood has this quality implies an atoning efficacy for the *ola* and *shelem* which involved the shedding of blood.

The doctrine of substitution is found in the Old Testament,[4] but it is not associated with the Temple sacrifices either in our prophets or elsewhere.[5]

In ancient times fasts were often observed in order to express sorrow for sin or to move God to compassion. Thus the king of Nineveh proclaimed a fast to avert the judgment threatened by Jonah; **Fasts.**

[1] *Nephesh.* [2] Lev. xvii. 11.

[3] P. 352. [4] See p. 288.

[5] Such expositions of the sacrificial ritual as Oehler, i., 389, are modern interpretations which may or may not be justified in the light of a fuller revelation; they are not reproductions of Old Testament teaching; *cf.* Schultz, i., 389 f.

and Joel exhorts his contemporaries to sanctify a fast.[1] The Priestly Code appoints a fast on the Day of Atonement;[2] and we learn that certain fasts were observed during the Exile and in the years immediately after the Return.[3] But Ezekiel does not prescribe fasting for his Days of Atonement, and Zechariah and the author of the closing chapters of *Isaiah* show no sympathy with the practice.[4]

Vicarious Atonement.

We have already seen that the Old Testament recognises the principle of vicarious punishment, which involves vicarious atonement. When Saul, for instance, had massacred the Gibeonites, the wrath of God for this sin fell on Israel after Saul's death. It was no longer possible to punish Saul, but Yahweh was reconciled to His people by the execution of Saul's descendants. Ezekiel, on the other hand, repudiates this doctrine.[5] But the principle reappears in our literature in a more attractive form. It is closely connected with the idea of intercession which we occasionally meet with. It was the duty of the prophets to stand between Israel and the wrath of Yahweh as "mediators". It was popularly believed, at any rate,

[1] Jon. iii. 5; Joel i. 14, ii. 15.

[2] Lev. xvi. 29, 31. The direction to fast is contained in the words ye shall afflict yourselves," E.V. "your souls" (*nephesh*), תְּעַנּוּ אֶת־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶם. *Cf.* Isa. lviii. 3, 5. In post-Biblical Hebrew תַּעֲנִית, *ta'ănîth* = fast; Gray on Num. xxx. 13.

[3] Zech. vii. 1-7.

[4] Isa. lviii. 3, 4; Zech. vii. 1-7.

[5] See pp. 289 f.

that men of exceptional virtue might obtain forgiveness for their own families, if not for others.[1]

It is, however, in the greatest of the Servant passages, Isaiah lii. 13 - liii. 12, that the principle of Vicarious Atonement finds at once its purest expression and its justification. The Sufferer, tortured by disease, shunned by His fellows, and put to death as a criminal, is regarded by His contemporaries as suffering Divine judgment for heinous sin; but in reality He was redeeming them by His sufferings. He was enduring the pain and disease which were due to them; He was wounded for their transgressions, and bruised for their iniquities. The chastisement, the stripes inflicted upon Him, brought them peace and healing. The fact of vicarious atonement could hardly be more clearly and definitely expressed; but still the passage does not provide us with any theory; it does not say why God should forgive sinners because an innocent man had suffered. Little stress can be laid on the clause "thou shalt make his life an *asham*"; the text and interpretation are alike doubtful.[2] *Asham*, as we have seen, has a double sense, and it is not clear which controls the writer's thought here. In early times it denoted compensation for injury, which might suggest that Yahweh had been injured by the wrongdoing of the sinners in question, and that the surrendered life of the Servant provided Him with compensation—a solution which only raises new problems.

[1] Ezek. xiii. 5; Isa. xliii. 27, where we should translate with *P.B.*, "thy mediators," מְלִיצִים, *meliçîm*, "rebelled against me". Ezek. xiv. 14, 20; Oehler, ii., 425.

[2] For instance, Duhm, Marti, etc., hold that *asham* was not present in the original text. It is retained, however, by Cheyne, *S.B.O.T.*

For the idea of *asham* as compensation has nothing to do with gratification of wrath or satisfaction of the outraged dignity of the Law.

Again, *asham* is used for a special sacrifice in connexion with cleansing from sin. Dillmann, taking the word in this sense, still finds in it the idea of satisfaction rather than expiation;[1] and probably, even when the *asham* had been stereotyped in the form of a sacrifice, it still carried with it the old suggestion of compensation. In this case, also, the use of the term merely tells us that the death of the Servant had the same atoning value as an *asham;* it does not tell us how or why it atoned.

We may hold that the language used emphasises not so much substitution, as the identification of the Servant with the Sinners for whom He atones; an identification represented in modern speech by the idea of the solidarity of the nation or of humanity. The Servant atones for Israel or for mankind, as Saul's kinsfolk atoned for his sin. Or, again, the author may simply be stating a truth of experience, that the sufferings of the innocent redeem the guilty from sin and its penalties, without intending to suggest any explanation of this fact.[2]

It has already been pointed out that repentance and amendment are not only conditions, but also results of forgiveness.[3] The forgiveness of the sinner is complete in the Divine desire and purpose even before he repents; so that sometimes deliverance anticipates forgiveness. So under the Christian dispensation, it is often the Divine pardon offered through the work of Christ which excites penitence.

Consequences of Forgiveness.

[1] P. 469; expiation = *Entsündigung*.

[2] *Cf.* Köberle, pp. 246 ff., 324, 374.

[3] P. 20.

Then, too, the forgiving love which meets the initial act of contrition deepens and confirms repentance, and calls forth moral energy.

The assurance of pardon is chiefly found in deliverance; thus Koberle:[1] "Forgiveness is at once forgiveness and deliverance; it constantly manifests[2] itself in external circumstances; it is experienced in help in the immediate present, and is associated with a confident expectation that the wicked will be destroyed, and that the rest of the community will undergo a moral regeneration". It is said of Israel, forgiven and restored, that she "shall not be ashamed,"[3] *i.e.*, her reconciliation to Yahweh shall be proclaimed to the world and assured to herself by conspicuous prosperity. One token of the rehabilitation of the Chosen People is the destruction of its enemies. When God forgives the Jews, He pleads their cause, executes judgment upon the heathen on their behalf, brings them to the light, so that they see His salvation[4] wrought for them, and their enemies put to shame.[5] Similarly the devout Jews of the Restoration saw tokens of the Divine forgiveness in the rebuilding of the Temple, the resumption of the sacrifices and the other ritual, and in the fortification of the city.

But even in the case of the community, and still more for individuals, we may discern a recognition of a spiritual assurance of forgiveness. Many of the passages which speak of forgiveness, either do not mention material deliverance or, at any rate, do not emphasise it. We

[1] P. 312. [2] *Dokumentiert.*
[3] Isa. xlv. 17; Joel ii. 26.
[4] *Çedhāqâ*, E.V. "righteousness".
[5] Mic. vii. 9 f., 16; *cf.* Isa. lxiv. 2.

hardly gather that those who were redeemed by the sufferings of the Servant of Yahweh became assured of their salvation because His death had been the means of obtaining for them material prosperity. On the other hand, they seem to know that they are forgiven because they are conscious of spiritual healing. In the same way Ezekiel associates the redemption of Israel with the bestowal of a new spirit and a new heart from God;[1] in other words, with an inner cleansing and a renewal of moral energy, which would be subjective guarantees of salvation.

Scope of Forgiveness.

The object of the Divine mercy is usually in our prophets the Jewish community. No sins, however numerous, heinous, or persistent, place Israel outside the pale of God's forgiveness. Even if His justice requires the death of the nation, yet He restores it by means of a resurrection; thus He destroyed its national life by the Fall of Jerusalem, but He renewed it by the Return from the Exile.

But God's mercy to Israel involved, on the one hand, the destruction of Israelites who persisted in sin, and the redemption of the penitent. In other words, there was a discrimination between individuals, some were included in and others excluded from salvation. It does not seem as if any sin in the past could shut out a penitent from pardon; the whole teaching of Ezekiel xviii. and similar passages is against such a view. But stubborn persistence in rebellion against God necessarily could not be forgiven while it lasted, and in time God's judgments fell. In other instances, heinous sin brought swift doom.

[1] Ezek. xi. 19.

In both cases God deprived men of the opportunity of repentance.

God's mercy also extended to heathen nations; they might repent and be forgiven, like Nineveh. Their punishments might be followed by restoration. Individual heathen might also be forgiven, and received into the Israelite community.

Thus the Divine forgiveness might extend to all mankind; but death cut short the opportunity of repenting and entering into salvation.[1]

There is no complete systematic treatment of redemption and reprobation; and it will be clear from the rest of this chapter, that the views set forth by the various writers are not always quite consistent.

Forgiveness, Summary.

The problems dealt with are only to a limited extent the same as those involved in the Christian doctrine of the Atonement; the latter is concerned with the individual, whilst our prophets look at matters from the standpoint of the community, Israel, which corresponds roughly to the modern Church. There are two main elements in the teaching as to Atonement, God's purpose and Man's conforming thereto.

The continued existence of a loyal Israel seemed to the ancient prophets a permanent and essential part of the Divine purpose, just as that of the Christian Church does to the modern theologian. The extinction of Israel was as inconceivable as the final destruction of the Church. Therefore God's forgiveness was ever ready for His people; He worked continually for their reconciliation to Himself.

[1] *Cf.* p. 297.

But however anxious God might be to forgive, there could be no reconciliation unless Israel also desired atonement. Thus conviction of sin, confession to God, faith, penitence and amendment were required. Yet though these are, from one point of view, the conditions of appropriating redemption, they are also thought of as consequences of forgiveness and of the blessings by which it is accompanied—a verbal paradox, which nevertheless represents a familiar experience.

Punishment is not emphasised as a condition of forgiveness, but it is sometimes implied. There are passages which contemplate the repentance and regeneration of Israel as a whole; the sins of the nation having been chastised by the destruction of the Jewish state and the captivity of the people; wherein the old Israel died to sin, that in the Restoration there might be a new Israel, raised from the death of sin to newness of life. But many passages of Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets do not contemplate the conversion of the community as a whole. The reconciliation of Israel is only effected by further punishment, the cutting off of stubborn sinners.

Incidentally, as it were, the atonement of Israel involves the Gentiles, *i.e.* mankind. Israel, enjoying the full favour of God, is supreme in the world; and this is necessarily accompanied by the supremacy of the God of Israel, Yahweh. The nations bring tribute to Jerusalem and to the Temple and come thither to worship. This chiefly happens for the glorification of Israel; but sometimes the redemption of Israel is a means to the salvation of mankind. In either case the Gentiles also are reconciled to God. Little is said about conditions, but apparently they are the same as for Israel, *e.g.*, the world is

made fit to be received into favour with God by the destruction of impenitent nations.

The salvation of the individual might be involved in that of the community; but, more often, the salvation of individuals consisted in their being forgiven, and preserved to constitute the new Israel, while the reprobates were destroyed. Practically the conditions of forgiveness on the human side had to be fulfilled in individuals. Apparently nothing but stubborn impenitence and persistent sin shut a man off from the Divine mercy. But here again the treatment of the subject could not be other than inadequate and unsatisfactory from the Christian standpoint. The prophets could only deal with the present life; death, so to speak, closed the account. It was possible to lay down the general conditions of atonement and to recognise God's merciful purpose towards Israel as a nation, and towards Mankind as a race; but there could be no consistent application of the principles of atonement to individuals. Some were cut off at once, others were allowed opportunities for obtaining forgiveness.

The result of forgiveness is material prosperity, deliverance; this, therefore, is a token of reconciliation to God; though not the only token, there is also an inner assurance and satisfaction.

The ancient ideas of vicarious atonement through kinsfolk are repudiated by Ezekiel; but we find the Servant of Yahweh suffering that He may obtain salvation for mankind; the Servant being probably Israel.

While sacrifices and other ritual are regarded as part of the normal religious life, and importance is attached to them by Ezekiel and still more by the post-exilic prophets,

they are ignored by the Second Isaiah, and nowhere is any stress laid upon them as a condition of forgiveness of serious sin. In Ezekiel, as in the Priestly Code, they are ritual acts setting right failures in ritual, and providing for the maintenance of legitimate national worship. *Kappara*, or the effecting of atonement, is ascribed to all sacrifices, bloodless and bloody; and there is nothing to show how or why the *hattath* and *asham* were more efficacious in this respect than other sacrifices, or how they differed from one another. On the other hand, it is clear that forgiveness was often bestowed by God without any sacrifices. None were offered during the Exile, and thus God's great act of pardon, the Restoration, was wrought without the fulfilment of any ritual conditions.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FUTURE OF ISRAEL AND THE WORLD: THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

We have frequently had occasion to notice that the world is dealt with by the prophets in its relation to Israel, almost as an appendage to, or setting for, the Chosen People. This is a necessary consequence of the doctrine that Yahweh was, at one and the same time, the God of Israel in some special sense, and also the Creator and Ruler of all things. In looking forward to the ultimate realisation of the Divine purpose, the redeemed Israel and the redeemed world are parts of one picture; indeed there comes a point at which these two elements, originally antagonistic, combine in a higher unity.

The prophetic descriptions of the future must be interpreted with careful attention to their real character; they are a remarkable combination of prose and poetry. They are not mere fancy pictures, mere symbols; they are anticipations of an actual future, and include practical details; note, for instance, Ezekiel's careful provision of salt for curing fish.[1] Perhaps it is not too much to say that the prophets would not have been surprised if their

[1] Ezek. xlvii. 10 f.

ideal pictures had been realised in detail. But, at the same time, these pictures are largely symbolic, because it is made quite clear that it is not of the essence of these prophecies that they should be exactly fulfilled in detail. God had unfolded before the eyes of His servants the vision of the future, a vision which no human language could adequately describe. The seers could only strive to give their hearers some faint and imperfect idea of its glory in the language and circumstances of their times. For them and for us nothing seriously matters except the moral and spiritual principles involved.[1] The modern hymn-writer describes heaven with its harps of gold, its gates of pearl, and its streets of gold, but he does not expect to be taken quite literally. In the prophets we can recognise that some passages are symbolic, and others practical or literal; but often no such discrimination is possible, and we must simply take the pictures as we find them.

The Day of Yahweh.

There is no entirely satisfactory term for the general subject of these prophetic visions. From the standpoint of Christian dogmatics we might speak of it as the Messianic Era; but this is not an Old Testament phrase, and suggests ideas that were not in the minds of the writers. The term Kingdom of God is broader and more elastic, and gives the modern reader a fair idea of what was meant, without introducing undue misconception, hence it has been included in the heading of this chapter. But neither is "Kingdom of God" an Old Testament phrase, though the doctrine which we use it to express, the Divine Sovereignty, is

[1] *Cf.* p. 209.

conspicuous in the prophets; even the title King is only applied to God somewhat sparingly; for it was often used of heathen deities, especially of the god of Ammon.[1] The familiar prophetic phrase is "the Day of Yahweh," of which Davidson says, the "manifestation of Jehovah is conceived as occurring at a set time, and with certain characteristics accompanying it; and in this aspect it is called *the* day of the Lord. . . . Though 'the day of the Lord,' as the expression implies, was at first conceived as a definite and brief period of time, being an era of judgment and salvation, it many times broadened out to be an extended period. From being a day it became an epoch. This arose from the fact that under the terms *day of the Lord*, *that day*, or *that time*, was included not only the crisis itself, but that condition of things which followed upon the crisis"[2]—in other words, "the Day of Yahweh" came to mean the ideal future for Israel and the world. The phrase or its equivalents "that day," "the day," "day of salvation," "day of vengeance," occur in all our documents except *Jonah*.

Time.

The ideas of the Israelites as to the time when this Day was to be looked for correspond very closely to those of Christians as to the Second Coming of our Lord, which is an adaptation of the Day of Yahweh. The Day was usually felt to be imminent, "It is a little while"; [3] and yet, as a rule, God was not supposed to have committed Himself to any definite date; the faith of prophets and Israel survived its repeated postponement.

[1] See p. 135, and *cf.* Boehmer, *Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes*.

[2] Pp. 374, 381. [3] Hag. ii. 6.

During the Exile, however, vaguer anticipations of the Day of Yahweh at some indefinite time, near or remote, blended with the definite expectation of the Return to Palestine within three or four generations. Jeremiah named seventy years,[1] obviously a round number. Ezekiel named forty years during which he was to bear, by way of symbol, the iniquity of Judah; also Egypt was to cease from being a kingdom for forty years. These periods may be in some way based upon Jeremiah, but it is not clear how.[2] The Return might be regarded as in some sense the "Day of Yahweh," just as the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is often held to have been the Second Coming of Christ.

But the hoped-for Return was not the only impending event in which the prophets saw the beginning of the Day of Yahweh. Haggai and Zechariah expected that the unrest of the Persian Empire in their time would usher in the Day of judgment and salvation; and Joel connected the Day with a plague of locusts. According to Davidson, when the prophets "observed a quickening of the currents of Providence in any direction, whether of judgment or salvation, the presentiment filled their minds that it was the beginning of the day of the Lord".[3] At the same time when the crisis passed away without issuing in a final judgment, the prophets did not feel that either the message they had received from God or their preaching of that message to the people bound them to identify the crisis with the Day of Yahweh. From a modern standpoint such crises are sometimes spoken of as "days of the Lord"; but it is doubtful whether such

[1] Jer. xxv. 12; Zech. vii. 5.
[2] Ezek. iv. 6, xxix. 11 f.
[3] P. 379.

language corresponds to the Old Testament idea, though of course we may say that "every act of judgment or salvation is a premonition of the day of the Lord"; [1] but in the Old Testament we do not read of "a day"; the Day of Yahweh is a final consummation of all things, always imminent, but never arriving.[2] At the same time, the prophets did not seek to construct a formal scientific account of the Day; they spoke of it in relation to the circumstances of their own time.

Ezekiel shows most plainly that the prophets did not intend to commit themselves absolutely to a fixed date for the Day of Yahweh. Usually he thinks of the new dispensation as associated with the Return; but in one section [3] he postpones its final establishment to a later date. Long after the Return, "in the latter days," [4] when Israel is dwelling securely, God will bring up against them Gog at the head of a great host of heathen, that these invaders may be destroyed in Palestine. "Behold, it cometh, and it shall be done, saith the Lord Yahweh; this is the day whereof I have spoken." Neither Ezekiel nor any subsequent editor seems to feel any difficulty in this apparent inconsistency as to the date of the Day of Yahweh. At any rate, they make no attempt to reconcile conflicting statements. In this twofold teaching we have the suggestion of the Apocalyptic picture of the Second Coming, the reign of Christ during the Millennium, the subsequent loosing of Satan, the gathering of the nations under Gog and Magog against the Holy City and their destruction by fire from heaven.[5]

[1] Davidson, p. 380.
[2] *Cf.* Davidson, Art. "Eschatology," *D.B.*
[3] Chap. xxxviii. f. [4] Ezek. xxxviii. 16.
[5] Rev. xx. 1-10.

The Day of Yahweh is not like the Kingdom of God in the New Testament which works like leaven, and is like seed which a man sows, and he sleeps and rises night and day, and the seed springs up and grows he knows not how. Rather it is after the manner of the coming of the Son of Man, which is preceded by tribulation in earth and heaven, and is as the lightning that cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west.[1]

Coming of the Kingdom.

The Day of Yahweh is heralded by the destruction of the Jewish state; by the crash of fallen empires; by invasions of Gentile hordes; by the visitation of locusts; by plague, pestilence, and famine. Partly through these experiences Israel and the world are purged of sinners that they may abide that great Day, and survive it, and enter upon the new era.[2] In some instances the Day of Yahweh is associated with a King of the house of David;[3] and sometimes nothing is said of any human King; and, in any case, God Himself brings about the coming of the Kingdom: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: Behold, I myself, even I, will search for My sheep, and will seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock . . . I will deliver them . . . I will bring them out from the peoples . . . and will bring them into their own land."[4] So too it is Yahweh who strikes the bow and arrows from the hand of Gog and offers his army as a sacrifice.[5] Similarly in Ezekiel's successors it is "I, Yahweh," who delivers Israel; who shakes heaven and earth, overthrows kingdoms, and fills the Temple with glory, and

[1] Matt. xiii. 33; Mark iv. 26 ff.; Matt. xxiv. 27 ff.
[2] *Cf.* p. 305.
[3] See next chapter on the Messiah.
[4] Ezek. xxxiv. 11 ff.
[5] Ezek. xxxix. 3, 17.

purifies the Holy Land from sin.[1] It is the coming of Yahweh with fire and sword that ushers in the new era. When He comes suddenly to His Temple, "who may abide the Day of His coming".[2] Prophets and angels minister to the advent of the Kingdom; and in *Malachi* Elijah is sent before the great and terrible day of Yahweh to reconcile fathers and children; and an angel is also sent to prepare his way.[3]

On somewhat different lines, we have the work of the Servant of Yahweh, probably Israel; as a missionary to the Gentiles, and a martyr for the sin of the race, He reconciles men to God, and prepares the way for the establishment of the Kingdom of God throughout the whole world.[4]

Material Circumstances.

As the Israelites looked for nothing beyond the present life except a shadowy existence in Sheol, the scene of the new dispensation was the present world. The citizens were the Israelites, its seat was in Palestine, and its capital Jerusalem. Hence to the prophets of the Exile, the restoration of the Jews to their own land is a necessary preliminary to the establishment of the Kingdom, while their successors speak of the gathering together into Palestine of those who still remained scattered throughout the earth. The restoration was not to be limited to the two tribes of the Kingdom of Judah; the exiles who represented the Northern Kingdom were also to return. As in the glorious days of David and Solomon, all Israel were to

[1] Isa. xli. 13; Hag. ii. 6, 8, 22; Zech. iii. 9.

[2] Isa. lxvi. 15, 16; Mal. iii. 1 f., iv. 1; Zech. xiv. 3; Joel iii. 16.

[3] P. 102; Mal. iii. 1, iv. 5 f.

[4] *Cf.* pp. 51 ff.

be happily united in a single state.[1] In this scheme a special importance attached to the Holy City and the Temple. In Second Isaiah, Jerusalem or Zion is a synonym for Israel; in Ezekiel, the City and the Land are virtually dependencies of the Temple; and the post-exilic prophets reflect the circumstances of their times in practically limiting the Kingdom to Jerusalem. The writers who are interested in the territory as well as the capital feel that Palestine is sacred, and as such is the only fit home for the Sacred People; but by this time the sanctity only extends from the Jordan to the Mediterranean; Eastern Palestine is abandoned. In Ezekiel the new Israel is organised like the old in Twelve Tribes; but Obadiah follows the actual geographical divisions prevailing before the Exile.[2]

Ezekiel also does something towards providing a political constitution at the head of which stand the Prince, *Nasi*, taken from the Davidic dynasty, and the Levitical Priests of the House of Zadok; and the later editors of *Zechariah* place the Davidic Prince and the High Priest together as joint-rulers of the community.

In *Haggai* and the original text of *Zechariah*, the Prince seems to have been supreme and the High Priest subordinate.[3] The House of David is prominent, together with other families in Zechariah xii., xiii., but some other passages are too absorbed in the Divine Sovereignty of "the King, Yahweh Çebāôth," to refer to the Davidic Prince or to the High Priest.[4]

[1] Ezek. xxxvii. 16 ff.; Zech. x. 6 f.; Obad. 18.

[2] Ezek. xlviii., but *cf.* Obad. 19 f., where Israel holds Edom and Gilead.

[3] P. 83. [4] Zech. xiv. 17; *cf.* Isa. lxvi.; Joel iii. 17; Mal. iii. 1.

In this new era Palestine was to enjoy exceptional fertility; flocks and herds were to flourish and increase; and the waste cities were to be rebuilt. Israel was to be again an independent state, dwelling in perfect peace under Divine protection.[1]

In a sense too the Gentile world belongs politically to the Kingdom of God. Our writers are not interested in the internal condition or the mutual relations of foreign states, only in their dependence on the Chosen People. Israel is to be not only free but supreme; the kings of the earth are to bring tribute to Jerusalem; Gentiles shall build its walls; they shall be shepherds and herdsmen, plowmen, and vinedressers to the Israelites; and the nation and kingdom that refuses to serve Israel shall perish and be laid utterly desolate. The nations dwell in safety under the shadow of Israel.[2] The new dispensation which the day of Yahweh inaugurates is to endure for ever.[3]

These various advantages might arise from the Divine blessing upon the ordinary operations of Nature, and from the influence of God's Spirit upon the will of Man; but there are other features in the prophetic pictures of the future which could be brought about only by extraordinary intervention on the part of Yahweh. The actual physical conformation of the land is to be improved; the barren highlands of Judah are to be irrigated by a new river whose source is in the Temple, a river with marvellous trees upon its banks and well-stocked with fish.[4] Elsewhere the pro-

Apocalyptic Features.

[1] Pp. 42, 84; the episode of Gog and Magog is a special exception.
[2] Isa. lx. 10, 12, lxi. 4 f.; Ezek. xvii. 23. [3] Isa. xlv. 17.
[4] Ezek. xlvii. 1-12; Joel iii. 18; Zech. xiv. 8 ff.

phetic imagination soars to loftier heights: "The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but Yahweh shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God shall be thy glory"; and sometimes the transformation of all things seems so complete that Israel is promised "new heavens and a new earth".[1]

Morality and Religion.

The Israelite state which we have just described, free, prosperous, and supreme, was to be at the same time an ideal religious society, a perfect Church. Purged of sinners by the Divine judgments, Israel was to be a righteous nation, under righteous rulers. The nation, however, was to be practically, rather than absolutely, perfect. Some passages seem to contemplate a moderate amount of venial sin, or even the appearance of an occasional "sinner". Ezekiel ordains sin-offerings and days of atonement for the new Israel. Not that the prophets were incapable of more perfect ideals—"The people," we read in Isaiah lx. 21, "shall all be righteous"—but the new dispensation was usually thought of as arising out of the old, with a certain continuity; and their sane, practical temper enabled them to recognise that the Divine discipline was not wholly catastrophic; sin would not disappear at a blow.[2]

The new Israel would be entirely devoted to God, forgiven for past sin, and assured of the Divine favour by a new and everlasting covenant.[3] The outward expression of loyalty to Yahweh was found in the Temple, its priesthood, and its ritual.[4] The political dominion of Israel is chiefly thought of as one condition or aspect of its re-

[1] Isa. lx. 19, lxvi. 22.
[2] *Cf.* pp. 253 f.
[3] Ezek. xvi. 60-63.
[4] *Cf.* pp. 245 ff.

ligious supremacy. The tribute of the Gentiles to Israel is chiefly offered to the Temple; foreign kings and nations come to worship there, and attend the great Israelite festivals. The whole world recognise Yahweh as the one true, Almighty God; the religion of Israel has become the religion of the human race. But still Israel holds a privileged position; Jerusalem is the religious capital of the world; and the Gentiles do the menial work of Palestine, that the Jews may devote themselves to the priestly service of Yahweh. Sometimes the whole nation are thought of as priests; but in any case the priesthood is limited, with one doubtful exception, to Israel. In order to obtain the full privileges of salvation the Gentile has to become a Jew.[1]

On the other hand, the election of Israel is for the salvation of the world.[2]

We may also call attention to certain passages which show how little distinction is drawn between pure symbols and anticipations of actual circumstances. Corresponding to the marvellous river in *Ezekiel*, *Joel* and *Zechariah*, we have a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness; and if Yahweh is to give light to Palestine instead of the sun, we also read of a Sun of Righteousness which is to arise with healing in His wings.[3]

The Old Testament teaching as to the Kingdom of God struggles under inadequate forms to express the greatest conception given by Revelation—the ideal spiritual society in right relation to God; the union of the cosmos, God, Man, and Nature, in an harmonious whole. The prophets are

Summary.

[1] *Cf.* pp. 188 f. [2] *Cf.* p. 196.

[3] Zech. xiii. 1; *cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Mal. iv. 2.

hampered at every turn by the necessity of speaking in the language and according to the circumstances and habits of thought of their time; for them this universal ideal had to be set forth in terms of a local, tribal religion, and of the brief, imperfect life of man upon the earth. Starting originally with the conventional Israelite notion of the Day of Yahweh as a day of deliverance for the Chosen People and judgment upon their enemies, the pre-exilic prophets added the judgment upon Israel; and their successors saw in the Fall of Jerusalem and the Exile the execution of that judgment. They were therefore able to recur to the old idea of the deliverance of Israel in the Day of Yahweh; the Restoration was to inaugurate a new era. After the Return these hopes persisted, and the Day of Yahweh now included judgment upon the Gentiles and upon the sinners in Israel, the deliverance of the Chosen People thus purged and purified, and the establishment upon the earth of a righteous Kingdom of God which should endure for ever.

The doctrine began to break loose on all sides from its ancient limitations; though still centred in Israel and at Jerusalem, the Kingdom extended throughout the world; all mankind did homage to Yahweh, and enjoyed His salvation. The Apocalyptic features, the "new heavens and the new earth," imply that the prophets felt that the known conditions of time, space, and Nature were too narrow and too poor to afford due scope for a Kingdom which was to be final and permanent.

CHAPTER XII.

THE MESSIAH.

The doctrine of the Messiah in its strict form in Christian dogmatics does not belong to the Old Testament, but is a development from certain features of its teaching mediated through the theology of post-Biblical Judaism.

"Messiah," of which "Christ" is the Greek equivalent, is an English adaptation of the Latin and Greek *Messias*, which through the Aramaic *Meshiḥa* represents the Hebrew *Māshîaḥ*,[1] "Anointed". **Term.**

The word Messiah does not occur in the text of the Revised Version; and in the Authorised Version and the margin of the Revised, it only occurs twice, in one passage, Daniel ix. 25, 26. Usually *mashiah* is rendered "anointed"; it is most commonly used in the phrase "Yahweh's Anointed"[2] or the corresponding "His," "Thine," or "Mine Anointed" as a title of the Israelite kings.[3] In our period it is also applied as an epithet to

[1] *Hebr.* מָשִׁיחַ, *Aram.* מְשִׁיחָא. The *ias* in "Messias" and the *iah* in "Messiah" may be due to the influence of the Hebrew form.

[2] Represented by "the Lord's Anointed," "the Lord's Christ".

[3] It is possible that in the *Psalter* these phrases are sometimes used not of an actual, but of an ideal king; and this seems to be the

the priests.[1] In view of the very limited sense of *Mashiah* in Biblical Hebrew, the terms "Messiah" and "Messianic" are inconvenient and misleading for a discussion of the religion of ancient Israel, but they are forced upon us by the usage of Judaism and of Christian dogmatics. We have also to recognise a twofold application of these terms. In older dogmatics they are chiefly used in connexion with the Person of Jesus, His Incarnation, Atonement, and the Salvation of the Elect through Him; and the term Messianic is applied to passages in which these events or acts were supposed to be predicted or typified. More recently less stress has been laid on the personal reference of these words; and "Messianic" has almost become applicable to any Old Testament ideal.[2] This last usage we need only mention, as we have already dealt with these ideals in previous chapters. It remains for us to discuss two topics: (i.) The prophetic anticipations of a Righteous King of the House of David; (ii.) The prophetic foreshadowings of other features in the Person and Work of Christ.

Van Oosterzee states the Christian doctrine of the Messiah thus: "When we speak of Jesus as the Christ . . . it is equivalent to saying that He is the King of

case with the words "the anointed one, the prince," R.V.; *māshîaḥ nāgîd* in Dan. ix. 25. See volumes in this series on the Wisdom Literature and the Apocalyptic Literature. In Isa. xlv. 1 Cyrus is called "the Lord's Anointed".

[1] Lev. iv. 3, etc., Priestly Code. In Zech. iv. 14 a different phrase is used.

[2] *E.g.*, Stade, p. 213, uses "Messianic" of the whole complex of hopes concerning the Kingdom of God; but however popular and inevitable this usage is nowadays, it is not in accordance with the terminology either of the Old Testament or of Christian dogmatics.

Israel, promised in old time by the Prophets, sent into the world by the Father, anointed by the Holy Ghost, and destined to rule for ever over a kingdom which is ever-enduring".[1] Rev. F. H. Woods put it thus, writing of "the great Future to which the prophets were continually directing the aspirations of the Jewish people"; he adds, "These prophetic pictures are most of them only so far Messianic that they came to be associated more or less definitely with the expectation of a unique Personality".[2] Professor G. S. Goodspeed's interesting and scholarly work is not sufficiently clear on this point.[3] His phrase "The Messianic interpretations of the pre-Mosaic Age" is used by him with a right intention; but it will suggest to some readers that predictions of the New Testament Christ are to be found in *Genesis*. The broad use of "Messianic" for Old Testament ideals is not confined to liberal Christian theology; it has also made its way into Judaism, even as to the future. I have heard a sermon by a Jewish preacher in which the ideal future was described as "Messianic times" and the personal Messiah was conspicuous by His absence. No doubt the broader use has great advantages for modern religion, and expresses valuable truth; it reminds us that the Hope of Israel did not emphasise a Person so much as a dispensation, a Kingdom of God, and that Jesus fulfilled much more of the Old Testament than the predictions of a future Person. But for the historical study of the Old Testament it is convenient to follow our documents in reserving the

The Davidic Prince.

[1] *Dogmatics*, Eng. tr., p. 527.
[2] *The Hope of Israel*, p. 117.
[3] *Israel's Messianic Hope*, p. 12, etc.

terms "Messiah" and "Messianic" for the personal element in the ideal future. In this connexion we may quote Dillmann: "We devote a special treatment to the Messias, not because he appears in the prophets as the only founder and mediator of the new kingdom and its blessings—on the contrary, many prophets announce a complete kingdom of the future without any Messias, and even in the case of most of the prophets who announce him, he does not appear with the overwhelming importance and significance attributed to him after the fulfilment (of these prophecies); but God does everything and the Messias only appears as the Ruler of the people and kingdom when they are already redeemed, transformed and glorified; so that in this respect it is impossible to mistake the great difference between the prophetic fore-announcement and the fulfilment—but we give a separate treatment to the Messias, because the fulfilment of the predictions as to the Messias has become the central point of the New Covenant and Kingdom, and therefore all that the Old Testament has to say concerning him is of special importance for us".[1] Having quoted this caution, which we entirely endorse, we will consider what part a "unique personality" plays in the prophetic pictures of the ideal future of Israel.

The use of the word "Messiah" shows that the idea of this person started from the historical kingship in Israel; the king, it appears, was the most important person in the community; and as its welfare in the present largely depended on the character and conduct of the actual king, so an ideal ruler was naturally a feature of the ideal future.

[1] P. 524, slightly paraphrased.

Sometimes nothing is said about the ancestry of this ruler. Thus in Zechariah ix. 9 he is simply "Thy King"; and in Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. simply "the Prince". But the almost unbroken sway of the Davidic dynasty in Judah led the prophets to derive the ideal ruler from the ancient royal family, and he is almost always connected with the house of David. In the case of some passages, indeed, it seems possible to justify an interpretation according to which the actual Davidic dynasty is set aside, and the ideal ruler is taken from another branch of the clan from which David sprung, or perhaps from the descendants of a brother of Solomon. If the oracle of the "shoot out of the stock of Jesse and the branch out of his roots"[1] be not Isaiah's, it may bear some such meaning; so in Micah v. 2 it may be a cognate branch of the royal house at Bethlehem Ephrathath which is to produce the ruler and deliverer for Israel, and not a descendant of the reigning king.[2] Similarly in Zechariah xii. 12 "the family of the house of Nathan," the brother of Solomon, appears side by side with "the family of the house of David"; and Luke's genealogy of our Lord is traced through Nathan, and not through Solomon.

In most cases, however, the ideal ruler is a Davidic Prince, either the living head of the House, or a descendant, in direct succession, the legitimate heir to the throne; or, at any rate, some one very near to the legitimate hereditary succession. This Davidic Prince is indicated in a long series of passages, some of which, probably,

[1] Isa. xi. 1-10. For the date of passages from *Amos*, *Hosea*, *Micah*, Isaiah i.-xxxix., see the sections in Book i. indicated by the references in the index to Scriptural passages.

[2] *Cf.* p. 130.

date back to the eighth century B.C.,[1] a series including in our period sections of *Ezekiel* and *Zechariah*, and probably others. Some of these and other passages require special notice. In *Haggai* and *Zechariah* Zerubbabel is designated as the ideal ruler of a Kingdom of God to be established in the near future. In the Day of Yahweh Zerubbabel will be as His signet, His chosen servant. The Davidic Prince bears the Messianic title of the Branch, and shares with the High Priest Joshua the title "son of oil," a synonym of "Messiah," *mashiah*, anointed.[2]

On the other hand, Ezekiel tells us that "my servant David" shall be king and prince, *nasi'*, in the new Israel, and shall shepherd the people. In this identification of the ideal ruler with the founder of the dynasty Ezekiel follows Hosea and Jeremiah.[3] These passages in their literal sense are parallel to Malachi's declaration that Elijah shall be sent before the Day of Yahweh. As the latter has commonly been understood in a literal sense, it is possible that the "David" of Ezekiel and the other prophets may have been intended literally, and they expected that David would be recalled from Sheol to rule the New Israel. Our Lord, however, interprets the "Elijah" of Malachi simply as one coming "in the spirit and power of Elijah," as we should say "a second Elijah".

[1] Isa. ix. 7, xvi. 5; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f., xxxvii. 24 f.; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxix. 16, xxx. 9, xxxiii. 15 ff.; Hos. iii. 5; Amos ix. 11; Zech. xii. 7-12, xiii. 1; but *cf.* above.

[2] Hag. ii. 23; Zech. vi. 12; *cf.* Jer. xxiii. 5; for text see p. 83; Zech. iv. 14.

[3] Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f., xxxvii. 24 f.; Hos. iii. 5; Jer. xxx. 9. Possibly, however, the last two passages are post-exilic; *cf.* Mal. iv. 5; Matt. xvii. 10-13; Luke i. 17.

Similarly "David" may merely mean a Davidic prince who shall be a second David, or may stand for the dynasty, just as "Israel" is both the patriarch and the nation. The latter views are more consonant with the general teaching of the prophets.

Ezekiel has other striking passages on the future ruler of Israel. After describing, partly figuratively, partly in direct terms, the ruin of Judah and its last sovereigns, he turns to the future, and declares that the Lord Yahweh will take a tender twig from the topmost branch of a lofty cedar, and plant it on a high mountain; it shall grow to be a goodly cedar, and all the tribes of the air shall dwell under the shadow of its branches.[1] From the context it is clear that the prophet is thinking of the king and the kingdom. As Davidson said,[2] "Kings and kingdoms are hardly distinguished, the kingdom is but the expression of the king". Ezekiel is probably thinking of the low estate both of the nation and the royal house; but the time shall come when a child, a Davidic Prince, "a tender twig," shall grow up to be a mighty king; and under him the slender remnant of Israel, settled anew on Zion, shall increase to more than its ancient glory. In simple grandeur and serene confidence this passage is the climax of the later[3] pictures of the new Israel and its King.

In another passage[4] Ezekiel declares that the perjured Zedekiah is deposed, and that the restoration of Israel shall be deferred "until he come whose right it is," unto him will God give it, *i.e.*, the royal authority. The prince

[1] Ezek. xvii. 22-24; *cf.* also the earlier part of the chapter.
[2] *C.B.S.*, p. 124; *cf.* Bertholet, *in loco.*
[3] If the passages in Isaiah i.-xi. are earlier.
[4] Ezek. xxi. 27.

thus obscurely indicated is probably Jehoiachin, in exile at Babylon. There is other evidence that he was regarded as the legitimate heir of the house of David,[1] though the verses dealt with in the previous paragraph suggest, as an alternative view, that the prophet may have had in mind a son of Jehoiachin. It is not clear why this verse, xxi. 27, should be regarded by many[2] as "Messianic in the stricter sense". The ideal element is not so conspicuous as the reference to practical politics, the substitution of the legitimate heir for an unworthy usurper. The studied obscurity of the language is eminently practical; it would have been fatal to have designated by name, as destined to rule restored Israel, a prince held captive at Babylon. We have here, however, yet another illustration of the way in which Ezekiel blends prosaic common sense with his ideal pictures. It is doubtful how far any special Messianic character is indicated by the connexion with Genesis xlix. 10, familiar to us in the rendering "until Shiloh come". The words "he . . . whose right it is" are possibly an interpretation of "Shiloh";[3] but the use of a well-known phrase need not imply Messianic meaning.

As the prophets looked forward to the restoration of Israel as an actual historical incident in the near future, they are chiefly concerned with the Davidic Prince who is to be placed at the head of Israel at its restoration. But they also suggest a succession of kings of the ancient dynasty. Thus "David shall never want a man to sit

[1] Skinner, p. 168.

[2] *E.g.*, Bertholet; A. B. Davidson, *C.B.S.*; Kraetzschmar.

[3] Read as *shel-loh*; but Volz (*ap.* Bertholet) holds that Gen. xlix. 10 is dependent on Ezekiel.

upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the Levitical priests want a man to offer burnt offerings before me".[1] Similarly when Ezekiel says that "my servant David shall be their prince for ever," he probably refers to the dynasty; elsewhere he speaks of the sons of the ruling monarch.[2]

There are, however, many pictures of the future of Israel in which the Davidic Prince does not appear—Messianic eras without a Messiah, to use modern terms.[3] In some cases the place seems to be taken by the nation itself; or as Smend puts it, "Messiah becomes a title of Israel".[4] Thus "the sure mercies of David" are promised to the people; and *mashiah*, "Anointed," is used as a parallel and perhaps a synonym for the people.[5]

Functions of the King.

The King is the ruler of the restored Israel, a feature, but not an invariable or necessarily conspicuous feature, in the prophetic anticipations. When Israel entirely regains the favour of Yahweh, He will provide her, amongst other blessings, with a wise, righteous, competent ruler, or succession of rulers. It is not the Davidic King who delivers the Chosen People, that is the work of Yahweh Himself; the King is not even the agent or instrument in this deliverance; he is a result, not a cause of the restoration. Even if Haggai and Zechariah contemplated the establishment of a new dispensation through the revolt of

[1] Jer. xxxiii. 17, 18; *cf.* verses 21, 26; xxxiii. 14-23 is often regarded as post-exilic.

[2] Ezek. xxxvii. 25, xlvi. 16.

[3] *E.g.*, Isa. xxiv.-xxvii., xl.-lv., and the later Messianic sections of *Isaiah*, *Joel* and *Malachi*.

[4] P. 384. [5] Isa. lv. 3; Hab. iii. 13.

Zerubbabel against the Persians, his part would merely have consisted in a declaration of independence and refusal of tribute; Yahweh would overthrow the great world empire. In a later oracle we read that in "that day" Yahweh will make "the house of David as God, as the angel of Yahweh before them". Yet the house of David does not seem to take any active part in the overthrow of the nations by Yahweh; they simply receive, in common with the rest of the Jews, the spirit of grace, supplication, and repentance.[1]

Such teaching as to the work of the Davidic Prince is quite consistent with the description of the triumphal entry of the Lowly King into Jerusalem.[2] Even if we read with G. A. Smith that He comes "vindicated and victorious,"[3] we must understand by "victorious," "having received victory from Yahweh". No stress is laid on the share of the King in obtaining deliverance for His people.

In Ezekiel xl.-xlviii. and in Zechariah the Davidic Prince does not hold a much higher position than the priests,[4] and in the former his special duty is care for the Temple and its services. The status of the Prince in the closing chapters of Ezekiel seems inferior to that of "David" or the King in other utterances of that prophet; the difference may be due to practical considerations. In his concluding chapters Ezekiel had in

[1] Hag. ii. 21 ff.; Zech. xii. 8 ff. [2] Zech. ix. 9.

[3] *E.B.; Minor Prophets*, ii., 467; similarly Wellhausen and Nowack. R.V. "just and having salvation," mg. Heb. "saved," or "having victory". The word variously rendered "victorious," "saved," etc., נוֹשַׁע, *nôshā'*, is probably passive in force.

[4] *Cf.* pp. 21, 83.

view the actual conditions under which the restoration would be effected and the princes from amongst whom the new king would have to be chosen. He could hardly be expected to speak of them with the unqualified enthusiasm with which he delineated his ideals.[1]

Thus the Ruler of the New Israel is a human prince of the royal house; he is apparently mortal like his predecessors; he passes away and is succeeded by other Davidic sovereigns.[2] This feature, indeed, is not emphasised; but on the other hand, we are not told that the King would live for ever or that he would be as eternal as the Kingdom; and such an idea was by no means one to be taken for granted, if it were not stated in so many words.[3]

Person of the King.

It is true that if we took literally the prediction that Yahweh would place "David" at the head of the restored community, we might also understand that "David" would literally be their prince for ever. For the resuscitated King would be a supernatural being, who might well be superior to the ordinary laws of human life. But, as we have seen, "David" is probably the Davidic dynasty or its representative.

If Isaiah ix. 6, 7 belongs to our period, the Royal Child whose birth is there predicted, might seem to be supernatural; but the text and translation are uncertain. Even taking it as it stands in our Revised Version, the sounding epithets, "Mighty God," "Everlasting Father,"

[1] As a possible alternative view it has been suggested that some of the Messianic passages in *Ezekiel* may be interpolations (Bertholet, p. 95).

[2] *Cf.* p. 355. [3] *Cf.* p. 362.

and the prediction of an endless reign, might be paralleled from the conventional titles of Eastern monarchs and even of Christian emperors.[1]

Priest. We have seen that in Ezekiel, Haggai and Zechariah the priest is placed by the side of the Prince as an outstanding personality in the New Israel. In Joel and Malachi the priests appear alone. In Malachi it is apparently a priest who as the "Messenger of Yahweh" is to prepare the way for His coming.[2] Even in the *Book of Zechariah* a later scribe has made a partially successful attempt by altering the text to identify the "Branch," the ruler of the New Israel, with the High Priest. This tendency to exalt the priest in the pictures of the ideal future is a natural reflexion of the supremacy of the priesthood in post-exilic Judaism.[3]

Prophet. On the other hand, as the influence of the prophets dwindled and disappeared in this period, so the figure of the prophet is almost entirely absent from the pictures of the New Israel. Joel, like Jeremiah, thinks of the whole people as the inspired recipients of Revelation; and when Malachi discerns the need of preparation for the Day of Yahweh, he does not hold that the community will produce a prophet, but feels it necessary to bring Elijah to life again.[4]

The Servant of Yahweh, as we have seen, is probably Israel in some sense.[5] But if we were to regard Him as an individual we should hardly describe Him as a pro-

[1] *E.g.*, in the Amarna Tablets the Egyptian kings are regularly addressed as "my god, my sun". See farther on this passage in the volume on the Pre-Exilic Prophets.

[2] *Cf.* p. 98, and below.

[3] *Cf.* p. 83.

[4] See pp. 352 f.

[5] Pp. 51 ff.

phet; He is unique and isolated; scribe, missionary, martyr, redeemer, "vindicated and victorious". He is not connected with either the priesthood or the Davidic dynasty, and His resurrection and subsequent triumph would impart to Him a supernatural character.

Foreshadowings of Christian Doctrine.

It will have been seen that the prophetic descriptions of the Davidic Prince who should rule the new Israel only provide us with some of the less important features of the Messiah or Christ of modern dogmatics. He usually appears as one of the results of the Divine restoration and regeneration of Israel, one of the many blessings of the new era; but He is not the agent by which the restoration is effected; sometimes He is not even mentioned. The idea of suffering for the sins of Israel or of the world is not associated with the Davidic King, but with the Servant of Yahweh, who is probably not an individual.

Nevertheless the chief elements of the Christian doctrine are derived from Old Testament teaching represented in our documents; and the less recent works on Old Testament Theology spoke of any passages which suggested such elements as "Messianic," a mode of speech which still prevails very largely. Perhaps the most important difference is that Christian doctrine combines and concentrates on Jesus ideas which referred to various persons in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the latter the Davidic Prince, the Priest, the Prophet, the Servant of Yahweh are usually distinct; the Old Testament says nothing of any person who is at once King, Priest, Prophet and Martyr; but the New Testament and still more ecclesiastical dogmatics invest Jesus with the attributes of all these characters, and also freely apply to Him

what is said of Yahweh and of Israel. We have seen that the establishment of the new Israel is not effected through the agency of the Davidic Prince, but is the direct work of Yahweh. Again, under the figure of the Servant, Israel redeems the world by its sufferings. But by taking passages originally referring to Israel and to Yahweh, and by applying them to Jesus, His work of atonement and His inauguration of the Kingdom of God are regarded as foreshadowed in the Old Testament. Indeed, as we said at the beginning of this section, "Messianic" has come to be applicable to any ideal of ancient Israel, because all these ideals are held to be realised in the Person and Work of Jesus.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INDIVIDUAL AFTER DEATH.

The prophets took little interest in the future of the individual after death, partly because amongst the people generally personal anxiety on the subject was held in check by strong family feeling and the intense patriotism of a small tribal state. On the one hand, a man owed much to his family, and sought to pay the debt by passing on his inheritance unimpaired, homestead, lands, religious cult, honour; it was much to him that his name should still be borne by worthy representatives; he lived again in his children. On the other hand, the hopes of worthy citizens and faithful worshippers of Yahweh also looked to the future of the Chosen Nation. The prophets especially were absorbed in their visions of the future glory of the people of Yahweh; the state destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar could be reconstituted by the restoration of the exiles to Palestine, and by their organisation as a new society. Or in other words, Israel, dead and buried, might enjoy a resurrection and an eternal life. If we in any way realise the spirit of Israelite antiquity we shall not be surprised that the treatment of these lofty themes is not combined with discussions of the fate of the individual after death. Somehow it is difficult to imagine

Jeremiah or Ezekiel discoursing on salvation in a future life, or even taking a personal interest in the question.

We should not, therefore, expect to find any great advance on this subject in our documents; and we have chiefly to look for illustrations of the traditional feeling and faith of Israel. The hopes of the individual with regard to the future are concerned with a happy death in prosperity in a good old age, with an honourable burial, and with the succession to himself of numerous worthy and prosperous children. Men do not enjoy an endless life in the New Israel; death is still a normal condition of human existence; and the special privilege of the redeemed does not consist in a resurrection to a still more blessed life hereafter, but in the prolongation of prosperity in this world. Every one lives out his full term of years, and to die at the age of a hundred is to be cut off prematurely, like a child or an accursed sinner.[1] The absence of any prospect of future bliss made men cling to life, and shrink from early death, so that Hezekiah complains "In the noontide of my days, I shall enter the gates of Sheol; I am deprived of the residue of my years".[2] Then, too, the upright die peacefully in their beds, and are gathered to their fathers, honourably buried in the family tomb;[3] while the wicked are cut off by sudden, violent deaths, and their corpses lie unburied, exposed to perpetual contempt and shame.[4] The promise to the restored Jews is that their seed and their name shall remain for ever; and that their children and their children's children shall remain in the land for ever.[5] As

[1] Isa. lxv. 20. [2] Isa. xxxviii. 10; probably post-exilic.
[3] Isa. lvii. 2. [4] Isa. lxvi. 24.
[5] Isa. lxvi. 22; Ezek. xxxvii. 25.

Piepenbring says, "God punishes the wicked, not after death, but by death, by an unhappy and premature death. God blesses the righteous, not with everlasting life, but with a long and happy earthly existence. The hope of having a numerous posterity, and surviving in one's children, is a far fairer prospect than that of the future life."[1]

Nevertheless a man was not annihilated at death; the body was left, and for an indefinite period there were remnants at any rate of the bones; so too a kind of spiritual remnant survived. And as the body was placed in the grave beneath the surface of the ground, so the dead spirit descended to a dim underworld called *She'ōl*, corresponding roughly to Hades, the Greek abode of the departed. The question has been often raised as to whether there is any distinction between Sheol and the grave; and it has been suggested that the various passages[3] which speak of the dead in Sheol as conscious and in a measure active, are merely figurative. Poetry often ascribes consciousness and action to inanimate objects. *Ecclesiastes*, for instance, seems to hold that man perishes as utterly as the brutes.[4] And as Oehler says in reference to this and other texts, "it might appear from these passages that the human being as a whole is annihilated in death, which has been given out as Old Testament doctrine by not a few".[5] This view, however, is rejected by Oehler himself and by most scholars in

Sheol.[2]

[1] P. 268.

[2] Probably the "Hollow Place," having an etymology parallel to our "hell"; *cf.* p. 19.

[3] Some of which are dealt with below.

[4] Eccl. iii. 18-21.

[5] Oehler, i., 246; H. A. Hahn is mentioned as one of these.

favour of that adopted here. The Authorised Version and even the text of the Revised Version hesitate between the two views, rendering *Sheol* sometimes by "grave" or "pit," sometimes by "hell" (Authorised Version), or "Sheol" (Revised Version); but where the latter puts "grave" in the text, the margin always offers "Sheol" as an alternative; and here, as often elsewhere, the margin is to be followed.

As Dillmann says,[1] "It is already almost impossible for primitive man[2] to think of a complete end of personal life at death. Even rough or only half-civilised peoples have some faith in the continuance of the dead, and with the civilised peoples[3] of antiquity (Indians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans[4]) this faith sometimes already appears in a very developed form." In this continued existence after death men are spoken of as the "dead,"[5] or the *Rephaim*,[6] "the shades" or "ghosts," usually explained as "sunken" or "powerless ones".[7] The word is also found with the same meaning, "inhabitants of the underworld," on the sarcophagus of Eshmunazar, King of Tyre, and in other Phœnician inscriptions.[8] It may well imply that those

[1] P. 391.
[2] *Für den Naturmenschen.*
[3] *Kulturvölkern.*
[4] *Klass. Völkern.*
[5] *Mēthim*, מֵתִים.
[6] רְפָאִים, Isa. xiv. 9, xxvi. 19. R.V. mg. gives "shades," A.V. the inadequate "dead," sometimes reproduced in R.V. text, sometimes replaced by the equally unsatisfactory "those that are deceased". The word has no connexion with the Rephaim, the ancient inhabitants of Canaan (Gen. xv. 20, etc.).
[7] *B.D.B.*
[8] Lidzbarski, i., 370.

who have descended to Sheol are a mere shadow of their former selves.

The abode of the dead is described as an underworld;[1] or, with crude and gruesome imagery, as a pit,[2] wherein we may even distinguish a lower depth, the lowest parts or extremities[3] of the pit.

In some passages the state of the dead seems devoid of consciousness; they are said "to sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake".[4] But probably we might paraphrase, "they shall sink to the shadowy, dreamlike state of the dead, and shall never wake to the fulness of life upon earth". The empty, colourless, feeble, ineffective nature of such existence is set forth in the "Writing of Hezekiah".[5] It is spent in the "pit of nothingness".[6] Sheol cannot praise God; those who go down into the pit[7] cannot hope for His truth. The denizens of these dim regions are cut off from all fellowship with God.

Our documents provide us with two companion pictures of Sheol. The Oracle against Babylon[8] describes the descent of the Chaldean king into the abode of the dead. As befits his rank, he enters, as it were, in state.

[1] Ezek. xxvi. 20, xxxii. 18, *'ereç taḥtiyyôth*, אֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּיּוֹת, lit. "land of under-places"; xxxi. 14, *'ereç taḥtîth*, "lower world"; probably one of these phrases should be assimilated to the other.

[2] *Bôr*, בּוֹר, often "cistern," and *shaḥath*, "pit," both characteristic of our period, their use beginning with Ezekiel, *e.g.*, xxviii. 8; Smend, p 505.

[3] "The sides" or "loins," *yarkethê*, יַרְכְתֵי, Isa. xiv. 15.

[4] Jer. li. 39, 57.

[5] Isa. xxxviii. 17 f.

[6] שַׁחַת בְּלִי, *shaḥath belî*.

[7] *Bôr*.

[8] Isa. xiii., xiv.; especially xiv. 9-20.

Sheol was excited, and its inhabitants crowded to see the new arrival, just as in Babylon the people had lined the streets to witness the state progress of the living monarch. In that dim region dead kings sat upon their thrones, and they rose to greet their brother sovereign, and wondered that the man at whose name the world had grown pale had now become as feeble as themselves. Was this poor ghost "the man who made the earth tremble and shook kingdoms"? His present humiliation corresponds to his former greatness; he is consigned to the lowest depths of Sheol, and while other kings sleep in glory, each in his own palace, the Chaldean is the prey of worms, and is cast forth from his tomb, a carcase trampled under foot.

Similarly Ezekiel describes the descent of the King of Egypt.[1] Pharaoh goes down to Sheol at the head of his army. He also is greeted by the mighty men who had gone before him; and he and his host find a place among the nations which had perished aforetime; Asshur, Elam, Meshech, Tubal, Edom, the Princes of the North, the Zidonians, are there, each in its own quarter; Sheol, like the earth, is divided amongst the nations. Here again there is some difference of status among the dead, degrees of discomfort;[2] there are some who shall not lie with the ancient heroes, but shall bear their iniquities upon their bones. On the other hand, when

[1] Ezek. xxxi. 15-18, xxxii. 17-32. There is clearly some literary connexion between these passages and Isa. xiv. 9-20. Perhaps both are variations of a conventional type; or the latter passage may be dependent on Ezekiel; so Bertholet.

[2] *Cf.* Bertholet on Ezek. xxxii. 27. The verse is obscure and corrupt, but in any case it involves the idea stated in the text.

Pharaoh sees the goodly company which he is joining, he is comforted. In neither picture is Israel among the dwellers of Sheol, because the prophets are dealing with communities, not individuals; other nations are dead finally and gone to the land from which there is no returning, but Israel is to live again.

In the language of these passages there is a certain confusion between Sheol and the grave. The King of Babylon spreads his couch upon the worms and is as a carcase cast forth the tomb, trampled under foot; Asshur, possibly the King of Assyria, lies in his grave, surrounded by the graves of his people. As Bertholet says, Sheol seems a collection of graves, a vast central cemetery. But, as we have already said, such confusion by no means indicates that Sheol was merely the grave. Popular feeling constantly associates the spirit of the dead man with his corpse and his tomb; witness the importance attached by the Egyptians to mummies and sepulchres. It was natural that the familiar circumstances of death should furnish images for the land which no eye-witness had described.

It is doubtful, however, whether men believed that the *rapha* or dead spirit retained any connexion with the corpse. It seems indeed that the shade might rest in Sheol, although the corpse was unburied;[1] but, on the other hand, the spirit once inhabiting the unburied corpse seems condemned to a lower depth; yet the two facts may be independent of each other. But again, we can hardly suppose that the carcases of sinners that are perpetually displayed, gnawed by undying worms and burned by unquenchable fire, are simply an edifying spectacle for

[1] Isa. xiv. 15 ff.; Ezek. xxxii. 17 ff.; Dillmann, p. 394.

the righteous. The verse suggests that the spirits of the dead are in some way distressed by the maltreatment of their corpses. Similarly in *Job*, the dead man mourns in Sheol, while his flesh suffers pain.[1]

The primitive Israelite theology did not discuss the ultimate fate of the inhabitants in Sheol, any more than Jewish science, if such a thing can be said to have existed, traced to its final destination the flesh and blood and bone which composed the corpse. There is nothing as to an end of Sheol, nor of a general release from Sheol;[2] but, on the other hand, there is no formal doctrine that Sheol remained to all future eternity the prison of the spirits of the dead.

Piepenbring holds[3] with regard to the doctrine of Sheol "that in all the documents antedating the Exile, this faith appears as a simple popular belief, and nowhere as an integral part of the religion of Israel," understanding apparently by the concluding phrase the religion of Revelation. Similarly in our own period those doctrines are a survival, traditional ideas which the prophets accepted by otiose assent, part of the framework in which their messages were set, rather than an essential element of their teaching.

But this teaching was not exhausted by references to conventional views; even primitive faith discerned possibilities for the departed other than Sheol.

Resurrection.

There are traces of ancestor worship in ancient Israel;[4] and possibly a post-exilic prophet speaks of Abraham and Israel[5] as exalted supernatural

[1] Isa. lxvi. 24; Job xiv. 22.
[2] *Cf.*, however, below.
[3] P. 268 ff.
[4] Smend, pp. 112 f.
[5] Isa. lxiii. 16; the reference may be to the nation.

beings from whom help might have been expected. Again, necromancy was a familiar form of magic; in ancient times the witch of Endor had called up from the depths *Elohim*, a supernatural being, who proved to be Samuel, and foretold the death of Saul; and Isaiah[1] speaks of those who inquire of the dead on behalf of the living. So too the ritual observed amongst the tombs after the Exile[2] was doubtless some form of necromancy. In two cases ancient worthies, Enoch and Elijah, were taken apparently to the presence of God in the full vigour of earthly life, so that Malachi is able to think of Elijah as returning to Palestine to resume his prophetic calling. All these features of primitive belief, ancestor-worship, necromancy, the apotheosis, practically, of saints and heroes, are germs of a doctrine of a real life after death, far beyond the ghostly, dream-like existence in Sheol.

The growth of such a doctrine was also fostered by the practice of speaking of the nation as a person. The Restoration of the Jewish community was thought of as a resurrection from death to a new and vigorous life in perfect fellowship with God; and the idea was more strikingly expressed under the figure of the resurrection of a person. The restored dynasty is called "my servant David";[3] Ezekiel anticipates the rebuilding of Jerusalem, yet he describes the punishment of the guilty city under the figure of the execution of an adulteress.[4] Similarly it is implied that the Servant of Yahweh rises from the dead.[5] Hence in view of the constant reflex action of language upon thought, it was inevitable that the form

[1] Isa. viii. 19.
[2] Isa. lxv. 4.
[3] Pp. 352 f.; *cf.* Smend, p. 507.
[4] Ezek. xxiii. 47.
[5] Isa. liii. 10 ff.

of the prophetic teaching should familiarise men's minds with the idea of a real life after death for the individual. Indeed, in the case of the Servant passages the personification was so thorough that it was possible to understand them of a person; this interpretation was soon suggested, and thus authority was provided for the doctrine of resurrection. An attractive idea which is familiar to men's minds is well on the way towards becoming an article of faith. It should, however, be noted that the cases of exalted representatives of the nation, David, Oholibah—Jerusalem, the Servant of Yahweh, resemble those of Enoch and Elijah, and would, in the first instance, only suggest the resurrection of exceptional individuals. Nevertheless the extension of the privilege to all faithful Israelites would be a very natural step.

This step seems to be taken in some passages in our documents. In the celebrated vision of Ezekiel[1] "the whole house of Israel" are called out of their graves, clothed with flesh, sinews and skin, quickened by the spirit of life, and restored to Palestine.[2] The vision may be merely another figure of the return of the exiles and the reconstitution of the state; the people in Babylon being thought of as a collection of dry bones. Thus we read that Yahweh said to the prophet, "Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, our bones are dried up, and our hope is lost, we are clean cut off". It is difficult to suppose that the speakers are dead and buried, and that the exiles are altogether ignored; for, although Ezekiel had a poor opinion of his fellow-countrymen in Babylon, he speaks still more

[1] Ezek. xxxvii. [2] So Kraetzschmar, Schmalzl.

harshly of their fathers in Palestine. Nor can we think that the exiles speak of the buried remains of others as "our bones". Accordingly there is much to be said for a figurative interpretation. But a metaphorical use of the idea of resurrection would at once suggest that such a process appeared possible to the prophet; thought would easily pass from the idea of happening in vision to that of happening in real life, and the transition would be facilitated by the popular habit of misunderstanding metaphors as statements of literal fact.

It has, however, been maintained that Ezekiel anticipated an actual resurrection of Israelites buried in Palestine as a means of restoring the nation. Thus Dr. Duff:[1] Ezekiel cries "to people the Holy Land there must be a resurrection of the dead who lie there. . . . It is his plan for repeopling Canaan without a return from the Exile." If this were the right interpretation we should have a long step towards a real doctrine of resurrection. It is true that the prophet is not formulating a general doctrine of the future life; he is speaking of an exceptional and miraculous intervention for a unique emergency. But as in the case of the resurrection of Christ, the special Divine act might well be regarded as the promise and revelation of a future life for all mankind. Unfortunately, however, it seems, as we said just now, that the figurative interpretation is the more probable.

But in a brief post-exilic apocalypse we meet with the idea of a real resurrection, possibly to an eternal life. We read: "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust; for

[1] P. 194.

thy dew is as the dew of light, and the earth shall cast forth the shades," *i.e.*, the Rephaim or inhabitants of Sheol.[1]

In view of our discussion of previous passages, it is natural to ask whether it is not possible that here also resurrection may be used as a figure for the restoration of Israel. Understood as referring to an actual resurrection, the verse does not follow easily on what precedes; as Dr. Skinner says, "It comes on us almost with a shock of surprise, so far does it seem to exceed the aspiration to which it is the answer".[2] Duhm[3] rightly points out that the abrupt introduction of such ideas without preparation or justification implies that the doctrine of resurrection was firmly established and familiar to the writer's contemporaries. It is, however, by no means impossible to date this section[4] at a time when according to *Daniel* and the *Wisdom of Solomon* the doctrine in question had become familiar to the Jews. On the whole, it is most reasonable to take the words in their straightforward, literal meaning, since there are not the same grounds for a figurative interpretation as there are in *Ezekiel*. The latter book is preoccupied with the imminent restoration of Israel, which is here already accomplished, and cannot therefore have suggested the figurative use of the resurrection. Moreover, Ezekiel is always dealing in symbols and visions, and his thirty-seventh chapter is expressly said to be a vision, so that

[1] Isa. xxvi. 19; *cf.* pp. 364 f. The text and translation are doubtful in some points, especially as to the words represented by the clause as to the "dew of light," but the uncertainty does not affect the main idea of the passage.

[2] *C.B.S., in loco.* [3] *Isaiah, in loco.* [4] Pp. 128 f.

any unusual features might readily be understood as figurative; but here there is no such reason for refusing to take the words in a literal sense.

But different views have been held as to the exact translation; as far as the mere words are concerned it is possible to translate them as a prayer or pious aspiration, "O that thy dead might live! that my dead bodies might arise . . . let the earth cast out the shades"; and at one time the verse was often understood thus. It is difficult, however, to combine this rendering with the command to those in the dust to "awake and sing," and at present most authorities[1] agree with the English Versions in taking the verse as a statement, "Thy dead shall live".

Accepting this view, we may associate with our verse another from the same apocalypse which declares that God "hath swallowed up," or "abolished death for ever".[2] Thus we gain the idea that the population of the new Israel will be reinforced by the resurrection of the dead, doubtless we should understand the righteous dead, and that henceforth its citizens will enjoy an endless life under the new dispensation.

In connexion with these passages we may quote Dr. Skinner:[3] "The doctrine of the resurrection here presented

[1] *E.g.*, Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, Skinner, Smend.

[2] Isa. xxv. 8. Duhm regards the clause we have quoted as a later addition, so too Marti and Cheyne. Cheyne, *P.B.*, p. 205, writes of it: "The insertion . . . need not be of much later date than the context, but interrupts the connection of thought. Moreover, the great and startling idea which it expresses would certainly not have been dropped as soon as expressed by the prophetic writer." At any rate, however, the sentence and the idea belong to our period.

[3] *C.B.S.*, with reference to Isa. xxvi. 19.

is reached through the conviction, gradually produced by the long process of revelation, that the final redemption of Israel could not be accomplished within the limits of nature. It became clear that the hopes and aspirations engendered by the Spirit in believing minds pointed forward to the great miracle here described, and thus the belief in the resurrection was firmly bound up with the indestructible hopes of the future of Israel. The idea is exhibited in a form which is immature in the light of New Testament teaching, but it practically represents the highest development of Old Testament revelation on this subject."

A word or two may be said as to the immaturity of the doctrine at the point to which our literature carries it. We have as yet no revelation of a universal resurrection; those who are to rise again are only the Israelites, and doubtless only the righteous Israelites. They do not rise to a future life in another world or in a different state of existence, but to resume their life on earth. Fellowship with God is to be more harmonious and unbroken than before, but apparently of the same character. The doctrine is held in a very crude form, and its consequences, or its relations to other truths, have hardly begun to be realised or even discussed. The question must soon have arisen: How could an increasing population, not subject to death, be maintained in Palestine or even in the world?

On the other hand, there are passages, not indeed connected with the idea of resurrection, which show that the inspired writers were becoming more and more sensible that the natural conditions of life, in the world with which they were familiar, were not adequate for the mani-

festation of the glory of the Kingdom of God. Hence prophecy began to pass into apocalyptic; and the prophets spoke of a miraculous transformation of Nature, of a New Heavens and a New Earth.[1] From the combination of these ideas of a new order of things with the doctrine of resurrection, there arose, through the mediation of post-canonical Jewish literature, the Christian doctrine of future life in another world.

[1] P. 108.

LITERATURE.

LIST OF PRINCIPAL WORKS CONSULTED ACCORDING TO NAMES OR ABBREVIATIONS UNDER WHICH THEY ARE CITED.

When only one work of an author is given in the following list, it is usually referred to simply by the name of the author, *e.g.*, "Bertholet"; and when an author's name only is given as to the exegesis of a passage of Scripture, the reference is to a commentary on the book in which the passage occurs.

Some other works of which occasional use has been made are mentioned in the footnotes.

A.B.D. Davidson, A. B., *The Theology of the Old Testament*, 1904 (T. & T. Clark).

B.D.B. Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A., *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 1906 (Clarendon Press).

Bertholet, A., *Das Buch Hesekiel*, 1897 (J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg i. B.).

B.I. Bennett, W. H., Adeney, W. F., *Biblical Introduction*, 1899 (Methuen).

Bleek, Fr., *Introduction to the O.T.*, Eng. tr., 1875 (Bell).

C.B.S. *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.*

Ch. *or* Cheyne, T. K.—*P.B.* *Book of the Prophet Isaiah* (*Polychrome Bible*), 1898 (Jas. Clarke).

—— *E.B.* Cheyne, T. K., Black, J. S., *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 1899-1903.

Cornill, C. H., *Einleitung in das A.T.*, 1896 (J. C. B. Mohr).
—— *Ezekiel.*

Davidson, A. B., *Ezekiel, C.B.S.*, 1892. *Cf. A.B.D.*
D.B. Hastings, J., *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1898-1904 (T. & T. Clark).
Delitzsch, Franz, *Isaiah*, Eng. tr., 1877 (T. & T. Clark).
Dillmann, A., *Handbuch der A.T. Theologie*, 1895 (Leipzig, S. Hirzel).
Dr. Int. Driver, S. R., *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.*, sixth ed., 1897 (T. & T. Clark). Also cited as *L.O.T.*
Duff, A., *Religion and Ethics of the Hebrews*, 1904 (Nimmo).
Du. *or* Duhm, B., *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1892 (H.K.).

E.B. *Encyclopædia Biblica.* See Cheyne.
Ew. Ewald, H.
Exp. B. *Expositor's Bible*, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (Hodder & Stoughton).

G.A.S. See Smith, G. A.
Giesebrecht, F., *Das Buch Jeremia* (H.K.).
Gray, Buchanan, *or* G.B., *Hebrew Proper Names*, 1896 (Black).
—— *Num. Numbers*, 1903 (T. & T. Clark).

Hermann, W., *Die Idee der Sühne im A.T.*, 1905 (Hinrichs).
H.K. *Handkommentar zum A.T.*, edited by W. Nowack (Göttingen, Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht).

Kau. *or* Kautzsch, E., *Literature of the O.T.*, 1898 (Williams & Norgate).
—— —— *H.S.* *Die Heilige Schrift des A.T.*, 1894 (J. C. B. Mohr).
Kayser-Marti. Kayser, A., *Die Theologie des A.T. in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung dargestellt*, edited by K. Marti, 1894.
K.B.W. Guthe, H., etc., *Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch*, 1903 (J. C. B. Mohr).
Kennett, R. H. The volume in this series on the *Pre-Exilic Prophets* (in preparation).
Köberle, J., *Sünde und Gnade im Relig. Leben des Volkes Israel*, 1905 (München, C. H. Beek).

König, E., *Einleitung in das A.T.*, 1893 (Weber, Bonn).
Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israel*, German tr., 1896.
Kraetzschmar, R., *Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1900 (H.K.).

Lidzbarski, M., *Nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, 1898 (Felber, Weimar).
L.O.T. See Dr. Int.

Mar. *or* Marti, K., *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1900 (J. C. B. Mohr).
Meyer, E., *Entstehung des Judenthums*, 1896.

Nowack, W., *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 1897 (H.K.).

Oehler, G. T., *Theology of the Old Testament*, Eng. tr., 1874 (T. & T. Clark).
Orelli, C. von, *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, 1893 (T. & T. Clark).

P.B. *Polychrome Bible.* *Cf.* Cheyne.
Piepenbring, C., *Theology of the O.T.*, Eng. tr., 1893 (New York).
P.R.E. *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologische und Kirche*, Herzog-Hauck, 1896—(still publishing) (Hinrichs).

R.S. Smith, W. Robertson, *Religion of the Semites*, 1894 (Black).

Schmalzl, P., *Das Buch Ezechiel*, 1901 (Mayer, Vienna).
Schultz, H., *O.T. Theology*, Eng. tr., 1892 (T. & T. Clark).
Sellin, E., *Serubbabel*, 1898 (Deichert, Leipzig).
Siegfried and Stade, *Hebrew Lexicon*, 1893 (Veit, Leipzig).
Skinner, J., *Ezekiel*, *Exp. B.*
—— *Isaiah*, *C.B.S.*
Smend, S. R., *Lehrbuch der A.T. Religionsgeschichte*, 1893 (J. C. B. Mohr).
Smith, G. A., *Isaiah* and *The Book of the Twelve* (cited as "The Twelve" or "Minor Prophets"), both *Exp. B.*
Stade, B., *Biblische Theologie des A.T.*, vol. i., 1905 (J. C. B. Mohr).

Wade, G. W., *O.T. History*, 1901 (Methuen).
Wellhausen, J., *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, pt. v., *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 1893 (Reimer, Berlin).
Wright, C. H. H., *Zechariah and His Prophecies*, 1879 (Hodder & Stoughton).

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

PAGE

ABBREVIATIONS, . . . 377
'Adon, *'Adonay*, . . . 134
Angel of the Lord, . 168, 170
Angels, . . . 167 ff.
Anonymous Passages, . 60, 130
Anthropomorphism, . 140, 158
Anthropopathism, . . . 146
'Asham, ... 314
Atonement by Punishment, . 305
— Terms, ... 299
— Vicarious, . . 59, 326
(Cf. *Forgiveness*, *Sacrifice*.)
Attributes of God, . . 133

BARA', . . . 136, 181
Blood, in Sacrifice, . . 325
Body, ... 225

CANON, ... 218
Cedeq, ... 258
Clean and Unclean, . . 251 f.
Community, Doctrine of, . 238
Covenant, . . . 193, 195
Creation, ... 178
Cur, ... 134
Cyrus, the Anointed of Yahweh, . . . 39, 44

DAVID, House of David, Davidic Prince, 20, 125, 349
Day of Yahweh, Day of the Lord, . . . 101 f., 336
— connected with different events, . . . 338
— Epoch, ... 337
— of Judgment, . . . 129
— Religious aspect, . . 344
— Signs of, ... 340
— Time of, ... 337
Death, ... 283, 297
Dreams and Visions, . 215, 217
Dualism in Man, . . . 225

PAGE

ECLECTICISM, . . . 4, 8
Edom, Rejection of, . . 190
'El, ... 133
'Elohim, . . 133, 164 ff.
'Elyon, ... 134
Evil, ... 257
— God, Author of, . . 177
— Origin, ... 178
Exile, Life during, . . 36
— Prophecies of, . . . 60
— Prophet of the, . . 38
— Return from, . . . 66
— Situation after, . . 72
— Unbelief during, . . 48
Ezekiel, ... 24 f.
— Teaching of, . . . 29 f.
— Work of, ... 33
— Book of, ... 9, 15
— — Contents, . . . 16 f.
— — Date, Author, etc., . 15 f.
— — and *Law of Holiness*, 21, 219
— — on Retribution, . . 289
Ezra, Work of, . . . 90

FAMILY, ... 243
Fasts, ... 325
Flesh, ... 224
Forgiveness, . . 33, 110, 202
— Conditions of, . . . 308
— Consequences of, . . 328
— and Repentance, . . 309
— Spontaneous Character of, 302
— and Sacrifice, . . . 313
(Cf. *Atonement* and *Sacrifice*.)
Future Life, ... 361

GENTILES, . 125, 187 ff., 270
Glory of Yahweh, . . . 163
— as Organ of Revelation, . 208
God, Activity of, . . . 199

PAGE

God, Benevolence, . . 151
— Creator, . . . 163, 336
— Eternal, ... 160
— and Evil, . . . 156
— Holy, ... 161
— and Israel, . . 154, 192
— King, . . . 11, 135
— Limitations, . . . 153
— Local, ... 142
— and Man, . . 147, 186
— Masculine, . . . 146
— Moral Person, . . 148
— Names and Titles, . . 133
— Omnipotent, . . . 158
— Omnipresent, . . . 164
— Omniscient, . . . 160
— Redeemer, . . 49, 137
— Repents, . . . 156
— Righteous, . . . 148
— Saviour, ... 137
— Supra-human Qualities, . 157
— Supernatural, . . . 164
— and other Supernatural Beings, . . . 165
— Transcendence, . . 30
— Unique, ... 165
— and the World, . . 171
Gods of Heathen, Polemic against, . . . 49
Go'el, ... 49, 137
Good and Evil, . . . 176

Haggai, Book of, . . 75
Ḥaṭṭath, ... 314
Heart, ... 232
Heavenly Bodies, . . 167
Ḥeṣedh, ... 151
High Priesthood, . . . 75
Holy, Holiness (*Sacred, Sanctity*), . . . 31
— Contagious, . . . 249
— of God, ... 161

Idolatry, ... 141
— Cause of, . . . 161
Individual, Problem of, 31, 197, 243
— after Death, . . . 361

PAGE

Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii., . . 127
Isaiah xl.-lv. (*Second Isaiah* or *Deutero-Isaiah*), . 36
— Contents, . . . 38
— Date, Author, etc., . . 43
— Teaching, . . . 44
Isaiah lvi.-lxvi. (*Trito-Isaiah*), . . . 103
— Contents, . . . 105
— Teaching, . . . 109
Israel, Calling of, . . 194
— God and, . . . 192
— Ideal Future of, 42, 80, 108
— as Messiah, . . . 355
— Mission to Gentiles, 59, 111
— Moral Discipline of, . 196
— New, ... 45
— Organ of Revelation, . 208
— Righteousness of, . . 267
— Religion of Pre-exilic, . 6
— Supremacy of, . . 47
— and World, . . . 47

Jehovah, see *Yahweh*.
Jerusalem and the Temple, . 187
Joel, Book of, . . . 119 f.
Jonah, Book of, . . . 126
— Teaching of, . . 126, 184
Joshua, High Priest, . 75, 80

King, in Ideal future of Israel, ... 355 (Cf. *Messiah*.)
— as Title of God, . 11, 135
Kipper, etc., . . . 299

Law, see *Torah*.
Law of Holiness, . 16, 21
Law and Miracle, . . 180
Law of Moses, . . 99, 102
Lots, Casting of, . . . 214

Maccabees, Period of, . 114
Malachi, Name, . . . 96
— Book of, . . . 97 ff.
Mal'akh, see *Angel*.
Man, Doctrine of, . . 223

PAGE

Man, Flesh of, . . . 224
— and God, . . 147, 186
— Heart of, . . . 232
— *Nephesh* of, . . . 228
— Spirit of, . . . 226
— Will of, ... 234
Matter, ... 173 f.
Melech, see *King*.
Messiah, ... 347
— Foreshadowing of Christian Doctrine of, . . 359
— Israel as, . . . 355
Miracle, ... 180 f.
Monotheism, . . 50, 166
Monsters, ... 176
Morality, ... 176
Moses, . . . 99, 102

NAME, Divine, . . 30, 138
Nehemiah, Work of, . . 92
Nephesh, ... 228
Ne'um Yahweh, . . . 216

OBADIAH, Book of, . . . 86
Oracle, see *Ne'um Yahweh*.

POST-EXILIC Fragments, . 130
Prayer, ... 254
Prediction, . . 49, 160, 209
Priests, . 118, 213, 248, 358
Prophets, . . 11, 209, 358
Proselytes, ... 188
Providence, ... 179
Psychology, ... 223
Punishment, Atonement by, . 305
— by Destruction, . . 296
— Purpose of, . . . 292

REDEEMER, see *Go'el*.
"Reins," 223
Religion of Israel, Distinctive Features, . . . 7
— Eclectic, . . . 8
— Prophetic, . . . 10
— Traditional, . . . 6
— in Maccabean Period, . 115
Repentance, . . . 309

PAGE

Repentance of God, . . 156
Restoration, Characteristics and History, . . 65 ff.
— in Isaiah xl.-lv., . . 45
Resurrection, . . 57, 368
Retribution, Delay of, . . 286
— Mysterious, . . . 278
— Nature of, . . . 282
— Principle of, . . . 279
Revelation, Continuity of, . 29
— a Divine Activity, . . 199
— Means of, . . . 201
— Modes of, . . . 214
— Scope, ... 221
Rewards and Punishments, . 277
Righteous and Wicked, . 110
Righteousness, Causes of, . 273
— Classification, . . 265
— of the Gentiles, . . 270
— of God, ... 148
— of Israel, . . . 267
— Nature of, . . . 261
— and Sin, ... 257
— Terms, ... 257
Ritual, ... 250
"Rock," 134
Ruah, see Spirit.

SABBATH, ... 105
Sacred, Sanctity, see *Holy*, etc.
Sacrifices, . . . 11, 314
— and Atonement, . . 313
— Efficacy of, . . . 319
— Theory of, . . . 323
Samaritans, . . . 112
Satan, ... 170
Saviour, God as, . . . 137
Shaddai, ... 134
Sheol, ... 61, 363
Sheshbazzar, . . . 70
Sin, ... 253, 257
— Atonement, . . . 299
— Causes of, . . . 273
— Classification, . . 265
— and Free Will, . . 274
— and the Gentiles, . . 270
— National, . . . 267

	PAGE
Sin, Nature of,	261
— Righteousness and,	257
— Suffering symptom of,	285
— Unbelief a,	265
Servant of the LORD (*Yahweh*),	52, 359
Servant Passages, Date, Author, etc.,	51
— Contents,	54
— Teaching,	59, 290
Soul, see *Nephesh*.	
Spirit,	33, 175, 226
— Holy, Personality of,	205
— Nature of,	204
— Organ of Revelation,	203
— of Yahweh,	201
Suffering symptom of Sin,	285
— Vicarious,	287
Supernatural Beings,	167
— God as,	165
TEACHING, Religious,	255
Temple,	11, 21, 111, 143, 246
Temple, Rebuilding of,	71
Torah,	116, 218
Transcendence, Divine,	30
UNBELIEF amongst Exiles,	48
— a Sin,	265
Universalism,	59, 64, 101
Universe,	171 f.
VICARIOUS Atonement,	326
— Suffering,	287
Visions,	215 ff.
WILL,	234 f.
Wisdom Literature,	116
Word,	207
YAH,	133
Yahweh,	138
— *Çebaoth*,	133
— Oracle of,	216
— Spirit of,	201
— Word of,	207
ZECHARIAH, Book of, Criticism of,	121
Zechariah i.-viii., Contents,	78
— Teaching,	84
Zechariah ix.-xiv., Contents,	122
Zechariah, Date, etc.,	121
— Teaching,	124
Zerubbabel,	70, 75, 82, 88

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES.

GENESIS.

	PAGE
i., ii.	185
i.-ii. 4	142
i.	172, 174, 178
,, 31	177
ii. 4-25	142, 174
,, 7	175, 226
iii., iv.	178
iv. 4	145
ix. 5, 6	272
,, 16	272
xxiv.	229
xliv. 5, 15	211

EXODUS.

	PAGE
iii. 13-15	138
iv. 24	278
vi. 3	194
vii. 3	157
xxix. 38	318
xxx. 10	323
xxxiv. 6, 7	151

LEVITICUS.

	PAGE
i. 4	323
iv.	266, 317
,, 2	321

LEVITICUS—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
iv. 3	348
v. 1-5	321
vi. 27	250
xiv. 29, 53	323
,, 53	322
xv. 16	322
xvi. 26, 28	250
,, 29, 31	326
xvii. 11	325
xxii. 14	321

NUMBERS.

xv.	266
,, 24-30	321
xviii. 21	97

DEUTERONOMY.

iv. 19	157, 192
vi. 4	165
xii.	22
xviii. 6-8	22, 25
xxix. 29	222

JOSHUA.

vii., viii.	306

JUDGES.

v. 4	143

I. SAMUEL.

iii. 14	321
vi. 3	315
ix. 6	211
xi. 6	206
xvi. 14, 23	206
xix. 9	157
xxiv. 1	157
xxvi. 19	145, 157, 278
xxviii. 6, 7	214

II. SAMUEL.

xxi.	306
xxiv. 13	187

I. KINGS.

	PAGE
xvii. 17	229

II. KINGS.

v. 17-19	145
xii.	22
xii. 16	315
xiv. 25	126
xvii. 24-41	10
,, 24	145
xxi. 3	9
xxii.	22, 220
xxiii.	22
,, 4, 11-13	9
,, 8	25
xxiv. 3	289
xxv. 8	84

I. CHRONICLES.

iii. 17	66

EZRA.

i.-iv.	66
i. 8	70
ii. 62	215
iv. 4-5	66
v. 11	135
vi. 13-18	88, 89
,, 14	78
vii., viii.	90
ix., x.	91
ix. 6-15	105

NEHEMIAH.

i. 3	92
,, 4	135
,, 5-11	105
ii.-v.	92
vi. 10-14	211
viii.-x.	93
ix. 6-38	105
xii. 16	78

JOB.

v. 9	140
xiv. 22	368
xvii. 1	201

PSALMS.

	PAGE
xvii. 13	291
xviii. 6	143
xix. 9	149
,, 12	226
l.	159
lxxiv. 9	211
lxxxix. 14	149
xcii. 15	151
xciv. 20	43
xcvi. 13	149
cxvii. 2	152
cxix. 142	149
cxxxvi. 1	152
,, 25	224

PROVERBS.

xiii. 6	280
xiv. 34	258
xvi. 2	309
xxi. 18	308

ECCLESIASTES.

iii. 18-28	363
v. 6	322

ISAIAH.

i. 4, 24	135
iii. 20	229
iv. 2-6	130
v. 23	259
vi. 1	135
,, 3	163
viii. 19	369
ix. 6, 7	352, 357
x. 33	134
xi. 1-10	351
,, 6-9	109
,, 10-16	61
xiii., xiv.	365
xiii.-xiv. 23	61
xiii. 4	134
,, 11	264
,, 13	147
,, 16	272

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
xiii. 20	296
xiv. 1-4	62
,, 1	147
,, 2	280
,, 5	271
,, 9	171, 364
,, 14	134, 147
,, 15	367
,, 19, 20	284
,, 21, 22	284, 290, 296
xvi. 5	352
xix. 16-25	130
,, 18-25	33
,, 19	246
,, 20	305
,, 24, 25	190
xxi. 1-10	62, 127, 187
,, 10	134
xxiii.	61
xxiv.-xxvii.	127
xxiv. 1, 23	128
,, 3	140
,, 5	271
,, 8	139
,, 10	127
,, 16	129
,, 21	129, 170
,, 23	143
xxv. 1	129, 150
,, 6	134
,, 8	129, 373
,, 10	129
xxvi. 1	129, 270
,, 4	133, 134
,, 5, 6	270
,, 7	150, 260
,, 7-10	129
,, 8, 9	230
,, 9	227
,, 14	277
,, 16	293
,, 19	129, 364, 372, 373
xxvii. 1	176, 270
,, 4	304
,, 7-9	128
,, 9	300, 313

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
xxvii. 11	261
,, 12 f.	128
xxviii. 16	134
xxx. 27	139
xxxi. 3	224
xxxiv.	64
xxxiv. 4	171
xxxv.	61
,, 10	302
xxxviii. 10	362
,, 17	365
xl.-xlviii.	38
xl. 1, 2	44
,, 1	46
,, 2	302, 306
,, 3-11	45
,, 4	182
,, 7	203
,, 8	160, 207
,, 12-26	50
,, 12, 15	159
,, 12	172
,, 13	160, 204, 207
,, 14	147
,, 16	159
,, 17, 23	159
,, 18, 52	165
,, 18	50, 142
,, 21	221
,, 25	50, 162
,, 26	50, 168, 175, 179
,, 27	48, 278
,, 28	136, 160, 179, 222
xli. 2	187
,, 4	50, 160, 165, 185
,, 8	48, 53, 147, 195, 304
,, 9, 10	45
,, 9	48
,, 10	48, 149
,, 13	193, 341
,, 14	49, 50, 135, 162
,, 17-20	45
,, 17	149
,, 18-20	200
,, 20	181
,, 21-29	50, 165

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
xli. 21-24	160, 182
,, 21	45, 135
,, 23	167
,, 25	44
,, 28	54
xlii. 1-9	54
,, 1	204, 230
,, 5	134, 136, 178, 185
,, 8, 13	154
,, 13	54
,, 14	146
,, 18-20	46
,, 24	311
,, 25	233, 294
xliii. 1	48, 136, 181
,, 2	45
,, 3	136, 300
,, 6	45, 48
,, 10	160, 165
,, 11	165
,, 13	158
,, 14	38
,, 15-21	45
,, 15	135, 136, 302
,, 16	48
,, 24	48
,, 25	46, 149, 302
,, 26	147
,, 27	273, 327
xliv.	303
,, 2	53, 193
,, 3, 4	45
,, 3	203, 207
,, 5-7	50
,, 6-9	50
,, 6, 8	165
,, 6	45, 135, 136, 160
,, 8	49, 134, 135
,, 10	49, 133
,, 16	224
,, 17	254
,, 18, 19	233
,, 22	45, 302, 305
,, 23, 27	173
,, 24	50
,, 26-28	46

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
xliv. 26	38, 73
,, 28-xlv. 5	44
,, 28	38, 187, 234
xlv. 1	44, 187
,, 3, 6	181
,, 7	156, 177, 181
,, 8, 24	269
,, 9	238
,, 11	48, 140
,, 12	141, 178
,, 13	38, 134
,, 14-17	50
,, 14	47, 73, 187
,, 15	222, 278
,, 17	47, 329, 343
,, 18	133, 179
,, 19, 23	149, 150
,, 19	208
,, 20	254
,, 21 ff.	50
,, 22	189, 305
,, 23	46, 140
xlvi. 1-5	38
,, 1, 2	44
,, 5	165
,, 9	133
,, 10	49, 50
,, 13	149
xlvii.	44
,, 1-3	279
,, 6, 7	306
,, 6	192, 194, 264, 269
,, 7	202
xlviii.	280
,, 1-11	49
,, 1	48, 265
,, 3	147
,, 4	134
,, 9, 11	46
,, 9	139
,, 10	294
,, 12	160, 174
,, 13	168, 179
,, 14-20	38
,, 14, 15	44
,, 14, 16	147

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
xlviii. 18	285
,, 20	38
,, 21	45
,, 22	280, 298
xlix.-lv.	40
xlix. 1-13	55
,, 1	193
,, 3	53
,, 6	56, 59, 189, 196
,, 7	135, 193
,, 8	140
,, 9-11, 12	45
,, 14-21	73
,, 15, 16	45
,, 15	146, 158
,, 17-21	38
,, 19-21	47
,, 22-26	45
,, 22	47
,, 23	73, 187
,, 24	48
,, 26	47, 135, 224
l. 2	302
,, 4-11	56
,, 4	134
li. 1	269
,, 2	48, 182, 193
,, 3	46
,, 5, 8	149
,, 5	147, 308
,, 6	160
,, 9, 10	48
,, 9	140, 176
,, 10	45, 180, 182
,, 12	265
,, 13	48, 178
,, 22	48
,, 23	47
lii.	144
,, 1-11	252
,, 1	48
,, 3	269
,, 5	46
,, 10	50
,, 11	38
,, 13-liii. 12	56

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
liii.	291
,, 4	285
,, 8	241
,, 9	260
,, 10, 12	230, 241
,, 10	316, 369
liv. 1-3	47
,, 5-8	152
,, 5	135, 136, 140
,, 6-8	303
,, 7, 8	193
,, 8-10	46
,, 8	140, 147
,, 9	49
,, 10	149, 193
,, 11, 17	47
,, 14, 17	269
,, 16	181
lv. 1	203
,, 2	230
,, 3	48, 49, 193, 355
,, 4, 5	47
,, 6	255, 313
,, 7	45, 302, 311
,, 8	147
,, 9	165
,, 11	207
,, 12, 13	45
lvi.-lix.	105
lvi.	189
,, 1-8	104, 284
,, 1	149, 287
,, 2, 6	253
,, 5	284
,, 6	240, 275
,, 7	111, 143, 320
,, 8	134
,, 9-lvii.	103
lvii.	263, 299
,, 1	260
,, 2	362
,, 7	318
,, 13	265
,, 15	144, 164, 226, 232, 264, 312
,, 16	303
,, 17	233

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
lvii. 18	140
,, 21	298
lviii.	263, 266, 313
,, 1-4	309
,, 2	265
,, 3, 5	326
,, 4	264
,, 10	230
,, 13	234, 253
lix. 1	140
,, 2	258, 280
,, 3-15	103
,, 3	264
,, 12	287, 311
,, 13	264
,, 16	54, 149
,, 17	147
lx.-lxii.	106
lx.	285
,, 1, 2	163
,, 5	233
,, 6	188
,, 9	135
,, 10-14	187
,, 10, 12	343
,, 12	297
,, 14	144
,, 16	135
,, 19	344
lxi. 1-3	106
,, 1	204
,, 2	286
,, 3	226
,, 4	343
,, 5	187
,, 6	111, 194, 239
,, 8	147
,, 10	147, 230
lxii. 1-5	285
,, 6	169
,, 12	111, 194, 239, 261
lxiii. 1-6	107
,, 4	233, 278
,, 5	54
,, 7-lxiv.	102, 107, 279, 304
,, 7	193

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

PAGE

lxiii. 9 . . . . 147, 153
„ 10 . . 147, 204, 236
„ 11, 14 . . . 203, 204
„ 11 . . . 163, 182
„ 15 163
„ 16 111, 136, 147, 288, 368
„ 17 . . . 110, 236
lxiv. 2 329
„ 4 165
„ 5 . . . . 258, 311
„ 6 287
„ 7, 8 . . . 110, 236
„ 8 . . 136, 140, 237, 288
„ 10 . . . 104, 145
lxv.-lxvi. 108
lxv. 110
„ 1, 2 . . . 193, 200
„ 2 236
„ 3 . . . . 147, 318
„ 4 369
„ 5 . . . 140, 250, 263
„ 7 289
„ 9 145
„ 11 . . . . 167, 263
„ 12 . . . . 135, 140
„ 13-16 284
„ 14 . . . . 226, 233
„ 17 175
„ 19 147
„ 20 . . 182, 253, 283, 362
lxvi. 299, 342
„ 1-4 . . . 112, 264
„ 1, 2 112
„ 1 . 145, 159, 164, 167, 247
„ 2 264
„ 3 318
„ 6 143
„ 8 183
„ 13 . . . . 146, 152
„ 14 147
„ 15-16 341
„ 16 306
„ 17 263
„ 20 . . . . 187, 189
„ 21 248
„ 22 . . . 193, 344, 362

ISAIAH—(*cont.*).

PAGE

lxvi. 23 . . 111, 188, 253
„ 24 . 284, 298, 362, 368

JEREMIAH.

i. 6 134
ii. 11 192
v. 31 210
vii. 18 9
viii. 1, 2 9
x. 130, 157
„ 6, 7 165
„ 7 160
„ 10-13 159
„ 10, 11 165
„ 10 160
„ 12 179
„ 13 180
„ 15, 16 220
„ 16 194
xv. 4 289
xvii. 19-27 . . . 34, 130
xxiii. 1-8 61
„ 5 . . . . 84, 352
xxv. 12 338
xxviii. 1 63
xxix. 63
„ 10 79
„ 16 352
xxx.-xxxiii. . . . 130
xxx. 9 352
„ 10 157
xxxi. 29 289
„ 31 120
„ 33, 34 209
xxxiii. 15 . . . 84, 352
„ 17, 18 . . . 355
xliii. 67
xliv. 13
„ 17 9
xlvi.-xlix. . . . 130
xlviii. 47 305
xlix. 6, 39 . . . 305
l. 1-li. 58 62
l. 2 167
„ 10 264

JEREMIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
l. 20	302
„ 25	134
„ 28	143
„ 39	296
li. 6	230
„ 9	187
„ 11	63
„ 15	208
„ 37, 43, 62, 64	296
„ 39, 57	365
„ 44	167

LAMENTATIONS.

v. 7	289

EZEKIEL.

i.-xxiv.	17
i.	34, 144, 164
„ 1	133
„ 2	24
„ 3	140, 212
„ 20	228
„ 22	31
„ 24	134, 140
„ 26	17, 31, 140, 142
„ 27	140
„ 28	31, 142
ii. 2	204
„ 4	134
„ 5	236
„ 8-iii. 3	219
iii. 1	230
„ 14	204, 220
„ 15	31
„ 19	230
„ 20	258, 264, 299
„ 23	31
„ 26	16
iv. 4, 5	16
„ 6	338
„ 13	145
v.	283
„ 5-15	293
„ 6	268
vi. 8	298

EZEKIEL—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
vi. 12	284
vii. 3	147
„ 26	214
viii.	9, 167, 263, 298
„ 1-3	202
„ 3	204
„ 4	143
„ 11	268
ix.	34, 169, 288
x. 5	134
„ 18	144
xi. 1-13	282
„ 1, 5	204
„ 1	268
„ 3	224
„ 16	146
„ 19	225, 226, 305, 330
„ 21	233
„ 22	144
xii. 21-28	287
xiii.	210, 264, 268, 298
„ 2, 3, 6, 7	210
„ 2	233
„ 3	227, 261
„ 5	327
„ 17	210
„ 19	230
xiv. 1-4	9, 195
„ 1	318
„ 7-9	210
„ 7	233
„ 8	195
„ 9	156, 211
„ 12-23	283
„ 14, 20	272
„ 14	186, 274
xvi.	29, 193, 267
„ 3, 44	274
„ 14	274
„ 26	268
„ 27	234
„ 30	233
„ 40	241
„ 48	268
„ 53-63	33
„ 55	241

EZEKIEL—(*cont.*).

PAGE

xvi. 60-63 344
,, 60 193
,, 63 . . . . 300, 303
xvii. 11-21 198
,, 16 264
,, 22-24 353
,, 23 343
xviii. 32, 152, 235, 263, 281, 289
,, 4, 5, 24 . . . 258
,, 4 230
,, 8 365
,, 14 293
,, 19 290
,, 20 260
,, 21-32 281
,, 22 260
,, 23-32 302
,, 24 260
,, 25, 29 150
,, 31 232
xix. 198
xx. 9, 14, 22, 44 . . . 149
,, 11, 25 283
,, 25 . . . . 34, 156
,, 30 9
,, 33-44 33
,, 38 . . . . 298, 307
,, 39 162
xxi. 3, 4 288
,, 7 233
,, 21 215
,, 27 253
xxii. 7, 23 264
,, 26 252
xxiii. . . . 29, 193, 267
,, 1-9 293
,, 4 195
,, 26 268
,, 47 . . . . 241, 369
xxiv. 15-18 . . . 27, 198
,, 21 230
,, 27 16
xxv.-xxxii. 19
xxv. 3, 8, 12 271
,, 7 297
,, 12-17 280

EZEKIEL—(*cont.*).

PAGE

xxv. 17 278
xxvi.-xxxi. 34
xxvi. 2 271
,, 4, 14, 21 . . . 296
,, 20 365
xxviii. 2 . . . 233, 264
,, 6 147
,, 13-16 173
,, 14-16 167
,, 14 176
,, 19 296
xxix. 6 271
,, 11 338
,, 20 187
xxx. 3 286
,, 20 318
xxxi. 14 365
,, 15, 18 366
,, 15 171
xxxii. 17-32 . . . 366, 367
,, 18 365
,, 21 171
,, 27 366
xxxiii.-xxxix. . . . 19
xxxiii. 33
,, 10-20 . . . 281, 310
,, 11-19 309
,, 11 . . . 258, 299, 302
,, 13-16 281
,, 13 280
,, 15 312
,, 16 302
,, 22 16
,, 30 27
xxxiv. 11 340
,, 23 352
,, 25 149
xxxvi. 1, 6 173
,, 18 267
,, 22 . . . 139, 311
,, 23 30
,, 24-32 305
,, 24-29, 25-31 . . . 33
,, 25 . . . 252, 261, 345
,, 26 . . 120, 226, 227, 235
,, 27 203

EZEKIEL—(*cont.*).

PAGE

xxxvii. . . . 226, 230, 370
„ 1 241
„ 9, 14 . . . 202, 227
„ 14 . . . 207, 241
„ 16 342
„ 24 352
„ 25 . . . 355, 362
„ 26 . . . 149, 193
„ 28 . . . 30, 193
xxxviii., xxxix. . . 35, 339
xxxviii. 10 233
„ 16 339
„ 23 182
xxxix. 3, 17 340
„ 12, 24 . . . 252
„ 17 319
„ 29 207
xl.-xlviii. . . . 21, 34, 36
xl. 3 169
„ 39 . . . 314, 316, 317
xli. 1-4 247
xlii. 13 . . . 314, 316, 317
xliii. 2-9 143
„ 2-4 144
„ 7-9 248
„ 7 268
„ 10, 11 311
„ 19 317
„ 20, 26 300
„ 20, 22, 23 . . . 301
„ 25 253
„ 27 . . . 250, 314
xliv. 248
„ 2-4 143
„ 7, 9 233
„ 7 324
„ 9 187
„ 10-16 25
„ 15 243
„ 18-31 249
„ 23, 24 . . . 213, 252
„ 27 250
„ 29 . . . 316, 317
xlv. 1 247
„ 9 . . . . 264, 265
„ 15, 17, 20 . . . 300

EZEKIEL—(*cont.*).

PAGE

xlv. 15 323
„ 16 265
„ 17 . . . 250, 317
„ 18, 25 253
„ 18 . . 250, 267, 301, 324
„ 20 . . . 266, 321
xlvi. 13, 15 317
„ 13 250
„ 16-18 23
„ 16 . . . 264, 355
„ 20 . . . 316, 317
xlvii. 1-12 . . 23, 182, 343
„ 10 335
„ 22 189
xlviii. . . . 240, 342
„ 15 144

DANIEL.

iv. 17 169
viii. 11 318
ix. 9, 25, 26 347

HOSEA.

ii. 16 11
iii. 5 352
iv. 8 315
xiii. 16 272
xiv. 130

JOEL.

i. 9, 13 318
„ 13 . . . 119, 250, 319
„ 14 326
„ 15 134
ii. 12 . . . 234, 312
„ 13 . . 147, 151, 153, 155
„ 14 318
„ 15 326
„ 16 119
„ 18 147
„ 26 329
„ 28, 29 120
„ 28 . . . 204, 209, 215
„ 30 168
iii. 1, 2 241

JOEL—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
iii. 1	119
,, 2, 19	270
,, 3, 19	265
,, 6, 8	280
,, 14	287
,, 15	168
,, 16	341
,, 17-21	135
,, 17	120, 187, 342
,, 18	183, 343
,, 19	119, 296
,, 20	193
,, 21	143

AMOS.

iv. 13	157, 160, 180, 200
v. 8, 9	157, 159, 168, 180
vii. 14	210
ix. 5, 6	157
,, 6	178
,, 7	196
,, 8-15	130
,, 11	352

OBADIAH.

1-9	86
1	134
3	233
15	286, 287
18	240, 296, 342

JONAH.

i. 5, 6	254
,, 7	180, 215
,, 9	164
,, 16	318
ii. 1, 10	254
,, 1	253
,, 2-10	126
,, 4	143
iii. 5	326
iv. 2	147, 151, 253, 254

MICAH.

iv. 1-5	130
,, 13	135

MICAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
v. 2	351
vi. 7	225, 230
,, 8	260, 313
vii. 2	260
,, 7-20	130
,, 9, 16	329
,, 18	302, 303

HABAKKUK.

iii. 3	143
,, 13	355

HAGGAI.

i.	75, 284
,, 2	134
,, 6-11	282, 285
,, 6, 9	66
,, 11	180
,, 13	170, 213
,, 14	227
ii. 1-9	76
,, 5	203
,, 6, 8, 22	341
,, 6, 21	269
,, 6-9	77, 143
,, 7	188
,, 10-23	76
,, 11-13	213
,, 12	145, 250
,, 13	229, 252
,, 15-19	282
,, 16, 17	66
,, 18	313
,, 21-23	78
,, 21	356
,, 23	88

ZECHARIAH.

i.	213, 218
,, 1-6	78
,, 3	134
,, 4-6	84, 85
,, 7-vi. 8	79
,, 7-17	169

ZECHARIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
i. 8	217
,, 11	169, 269
,, 12	85, 170
,, 18, 20	85
,, 21	270
ii. 6-13	64
,, 11	188
iii.	304
,, 1	170
,, 4	249
,, 7	78
,, 9	341
iv. 1	217
,, 6-10	82
,, 6	203
,, 9	85
,, 10	140, 160
,, 14	135, 146, 352
v.	265
,, 1-4	244
,, 3	264, 298, 307
,, 4	264
,, 5-11	274
vi. 1-8	169
,, 1	85
,, 5	135
,, 9-15	83
,, 12	89, 352
,, 13	78
vii.-viii.	83
vii.	263, 266, 284
,, 1-7	326
,, 2	253, 254
,, 5	338
,, 7-11	84
,, 11	225
,, 12	204, 234
viii.	250
,, 3	143, 144, 149
,, 4	283
,, 7, 8	241
,, 8	159
,, 9-12	282
,, 9	78, 313
,, 10	66
,, 12	180

ZECHARIAH—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
viii. 14, 15	149
,, 17	147, 233
,, 18	266
,, 19	85
,, 21, 22	253
,, 22	188
ix.-xi.	122
ix. 7, 9, 10	125
,, 9	351, 356
,, 10, 13	124
,, 13	121, 240
,, 14, 15	125
,, 14	124
x. 1	180
,, 3	277
,, 6	342
,, 7	124, 240
,, 8	302
xi. 2-6	125
xii.-xiii. 6	123, 125
xii.	240
,, 1	175
,, 5	134, 233
,, 7-12	352
,, 7, 10	125
,, 8	125, 356
,, 10	227, 254
,, 12	351
,, 13	248
xiii.	211
,, 1	125, 345, 352
,, 2-6	125
,, 2	170, 252
,, 7-9	122
,, 7	153, 291
,, 8	307
xiv.	123, 286, 293
,, 3	341
,, 8, 10	183, 343
,, 13, 14	123, 125
,, 16-21	143
,, 16	188
,, 17-19	188
,, 17	342
,, 20, 21	194, 239
,, 21	134

MALACHI.

	PAGE
i.	319
,, 1	213, 240
,, 2-5	97
,, 2	191
,, 3	147
,, 4	296
,, 6-ii. 9	98
,, 6	102, 134, 136, 250
,, 7, 14	90
,, 8-14	99, 318
,, 10	134
,, 11	101, 189, 318
,, 14	102
ii. 1-9	213
,, 1	227
,, 4, 8	97
,, 4	248
,, 5	283
,, 6-9	221
,, 6	100
,, 7	170
,, 8	264
,, 9	90
,, 10-iv. 6	98
,, 10-16	91, 100
,, 10	102, 197
,, 11, 13	100
,, 11	133
,, 12	298
,, 13	254
,, 14	264
,, 15, 16	228
,, 17	135, 147, 279, 285
iii.	285, 319
,, 1-4	144
,, 1	96, 100, 102, 143, 170, 341, 342
,, 3	97, 294
,, 4	100
,, 5	263, 264, 265, 298
,, 6	149
,, 7-12	90, 253, 282, 309
,, 8	99
,, 10	97, 313
,, 11	90, 284
,, 13-18	95
,, 14, 15	279

MALACHI—(*cont.*).

	PAGE
iii. 16	102, 160, 286
,, 18	259
iv. 1-3	102, 293
,, 1	286, 298, 307, 341
,, 2	345
,, 4-6	99, 102
,, 4	97
,, 5	341, 352
,, 6	234

MATTHEW.

xi. 14	53
xiii. 33	340
xvii. 10-13	352
xxiv. 27	340

MARK.

iv. 26	340

LUKE.

i. 17	352
iv. 18, 19	106
xiv. 26	191

JOHN.

ix. 2	286

ACTS.

xi. 24	152

ROMANS.

ix. 6	240
,, 19	237

HEBREWS.

xi. 6	5

REVELATIONS.

xii. 7	6
xx. 1-10	339
xxi. 22	320

Crown quarto, 1008 Pages, with Four Maps, price 20s. net; or in Half-Leather Binding, 25s. net.

DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

COMPLETE IN ONE VOLUME.

[EDITED BY]

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

It is not based on any other Dictionary, but is a wholly new and original Work.

Every Article is signed by the Author. This is the first time that all the Articles in a single-volume Dictionary of the Bible have been committed to Specialists and bear their signatures, as in the largest Dictionaries.

Prospectus, with Specimen Page and List of Authors, post free on application.

'A very fine achievement, worthy to stand beside his larger Dictionaries, and by far the most scholarly yet produced in one volume in English-speaking countries, perhaps it may be said in the world.'—*Christian World.*

'The names of the editor and assistants alone are guarantees for the thoroughness with which everything that belongs to the production of a dictionary is attended to, and nothing could surpass the care, clearness, and accuracy which characterise the work from beginning to end.'—*Churchman.*

'To produce in a single volume a Dictionary of the Bible sufficiently ample in its scope and plan, abreast of present scholarship, not too elementary to be of use to students and ministers, and not too technical and scholastic in its method for an ordinary reader is, as will be readily understood, an extremely difficult undertaking. So far as our examination of it has gone, it has been admirably accomplished.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

'An exceedingly valuable and comprehensive work.'—*Record.*

'The work is able, scholarly, and of a thoroughly trustworthy kind. The editor has been able to enlist the foremost scholars of our time. We must call attention to the careful and masterly sub-editing. It is as near perfection as is possible for man to attain.'—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

'Thoroughly abreast of present-day knowledge. For presentation and library purposes the book outstrips all its rivals, and its closely packed pages are a perfect mine for teachers and ministers.'—*Sunday School Chronicle.*

'No pains have been spared to make the book thoroughly reliable and up to date.'—*Scotsman.*

PROFESSOR ZAHN'S GREAT 'INTRODUCTION.'

An Introduction to the New Testament. By Professor THEODOR ZAHN, Erlangen. Translated from the last German edition, and containing Professor ZAHN'S very latest emendations. Three large Volumes, including Full Notes, Chronological Table, and Complete Indexes. Price 36s. net.

'Not so much a book as a library. . . . A repertory of facts and discussions which possesses immense value for the student of the N.T. The studious minister will find it full of valuable material, and theological colleges will be certain to purchase and prize it.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

BY J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D., LATE PRINCIPAL, WESTMINSTER COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence. Post 8vo, 6s. net.

'Dr. Dykes touches no subject which he does not adorn, and these lectures are a masterly attempt to reshape the traditional doctrine of Creation and Providence by the light which the last century has cast upon both nature and history. The lucid style and the restrained force of the book will make a deep impression on a thoughtful reader.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

The Christian Minister and his Duties. Price 6s. net.

'The whole course of a minister's life is brought under review, and most valuable advice and counsel is given at every point. Dr. Dykes' view is singularly broad and comprehensive, and his work is that of a profound scholar, a practic teacher, and an earnest man of God.'—*Methodist Times.*

The Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit. By A. C. DOWNER, D.D., Late of Christ Church, Harrow Road, London; now at Hyères. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

'It is only when we read this complete account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, that we understand why there has been so much misapprehension among us, and so much mistaken and even mischievous writing, about the Holy Spirit. This book will be found to be indispensable.'—*Expository Times.*

The Tests of Life. A Study of the First Epistle of St. John. By Prof. ROBERT LAW, B.D., Toronto. Second Edition. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

'No more masterly contribution has for long been made to New Testament exegesis and theology. No New Testament book of our time better deserves, or will better repay, the most careful study.'—*British Weekly.*

Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought. A Series of Discussions concerning the Place of the Old Testament Documents in the Life of To-day. By Professor W. G. JORDAN, D.D., Queen's University, Canada. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

'Under his hand the whole subject is invested with life and interest, and one can hardly imagine the intelligent man who would not follow each chapter with keen pleasure. We give a warm welcome to this book.'—*Christian World.*

The Background of the Gospels; or, Judaism in the Period between the Old and New Testaments. (The Twentieth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.) By WILLIAM FAIRWEATHER, M.A., D.D., Kirkcaldy. Demy 8vo, 8s. net.

'As an introduction to the study of this period, his book is the best now to be had in English.'—*Times.*

Authority in Religion. By Rev. JOSEPH H. LECKIE, Cupar-Fife. Post 8vo, 5s.

'An exceedingly well-written book. Mr. Leckie is thoroughly furnished as to the material of his subject, and has the faculty of making it entirely interesting. On a theme which has been dealt with by such a host of authorities, it seems difficult to say anything new, but readers will find here a freshness of statement combined with a courage and candour which hold the attention throughout.'—*Christian World.*

The Bible of Nature. By J. ARTHUR THOMSON, M.A., Regius Professor of Natural History, University of Aberdeen. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

'For such a task as he has here essayed, Professor Thomson is peculiarly fitted alike by his eminent scientific acquirements, his profound sympathy with religious feelings and values, and his gifts as an expositor. The scientific interest is the leading one throughout, but the bearings of scientific truth upon religion are never lost sight of, and the real harmony between Christian theism and the doctrine of evolution is brought out in a most convincing fashion.'—*Glasgow Herald.*

How God has Spoken; or, Divine Revelation in Nature, in Man, in Hebrew History, and in Jesus Christ. By JOHN WILSON, M.A., D.D., Lausanne. Post 8vo, 5s. net.

'A profoundly learned and truly beautiful book. It will be a feast for ministers and others who hunger for something more than excellent commonplace in their reading.'—*Homiletic Review.*

Sixty Years with the Bible. A Record of Experience. By Prof. W. N. CLARKE, D.D., Author of 'An Outline of Christian Theology,' etc. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

'A most suggestive survey of the changes in the view and treatment of the Scriptures which have taken place in his own lifetime and experience. Few more suggestive books on this great central theme have been published for many a day.'—*Methodist Recorder.*

BY THE REV. W. L. WALKER.

Christian Theism and a Spiritual Monism. God, Freedom, and Immortality, in View of Monistic Evolution. Second Edition. Demy 8vo, 9s.

'A valuable contribution to Christian thought and a real help to Christian faith, and in all respects a work worthy of the author's already high reputation among theological writers.'—*Examiner.*

The Spirit and the Incarnation. In the Light of Scripture, Science, and Practical Need. Third Edition, Revised and Re-set. Demy 8vo, 9s.

In a leading article, headed '**A GREAT BOOK,**' in the *British Weekly*, Dr. MARCUS DODS wrote: 'It may be questioned whether in recent years there has appeared, at home or abroad, any theological work more deserving of careful study. He who intelligently reads it once will inevitably read it again and again.'

The Cross and the Kingdom, as Viewed by Christ Himself and in the Light of Evolution. Second Edition, Revised. 8vo, 9s.

'We desire to speak with admiration of the good work done in this book. It is worthy to stand beside his former treatise. Taking both together, they form a magnificent contribution to the theological literature of the age.'—Principal IVERACH, in the *Expository Times.*

What about the New Theology? Second Edition. Post 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

'Of the three books which lie before us, we may—and indeed must—say at once that only one (Mr. Walker's) strikes us as being in any sense a contribution to the subject. In reading his pages we have the sensation that this is no partisan or retained pleader, but a Christian thinker solely and entirely concerned to elucidate the truth to the best of his ability.'—*Christian Commonwealth.*

The Teaching of Christ in its Present Appeal. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

'Mr. Walker, well known by his other great books, has written a really helpful, edifying and inspiring little book. He brings us into the very room where Christ is. We hear his voice.'—*Expository Times.*

The Gospel of Reconciliation; or, At-One-Ment. Post 8vo, 5s.

'One of the most helpful, illuminating, and spiritual expositions of this most fascinating of all subjects of Christian Theology.'—*Review of Theology and Philosophy.*

The Self-Revelation of our Lord. By the Rev. J. C. V. DURELL, B.D., Rector of Rotherhithe. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

'There is no book which we have seen which sets forth the New Testament doctrine more candidly or more convincingly than this book.'—*Expository Times.*

Early Ideals of Righteousness. Hebrew, Greek, and Roman. By Professor R. H. KENNETT, B.D., Mrs. ADAM, M.A., and Professor H. M. GWATKIN, D.D. Post 8vo, 3s. net.

These three lectures summarise the Ideals of Righteousness formed by the three great nations of antiquity.

THE SCHOLAR AS PREACHER.

These volumes are carefully chosen. They are chosen because their authors are scholars as well as preachers, for the suggestiveness of their thought, and because they are saturated with the most promising ideas of the present day.

The Eye for Spiritual Things. By H. M. GWATKIN, D.D., Cambridge. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Bread and Salt from the Word of God. In Sixteen Sermons. By Professor THEODOR ZAHN, University of Erlangen. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Faith and Knowledge. By Professor W. R. INGE, D.D., Cambridge. Second Edition. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

'The volume is one which is likely to be especially helpful to preachers, as giving them fresh materials for thought.'—*Guardian.*

Christus in Ecclesia. By the Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.C.L., New College, Oxford. Now ready, post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

'A book which should prove very useful to the inquiring student.'—*Oxford Review.*

Jesus Christ the Son of God. Sermons and Interpretations. By W. M. MACGREGOR, D.D., Edinburgh. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

'A volume which strikes a distinct note of its own, and contains some of the freshest, strongest, and most human work which one has met with for many a day in the pulpit literature of Scotland.'—*Edinburgh Evening News.*

SECOND SERIES.

Some of God's Ministries. By the Rev. W. M. MACGREGOR. D.D., Edinburgh. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Dr. Macgregor's Volume in the First Series, entitled 'Jesus Christ the Son of God,' has already gone through three large editions.

Christ and Christ's Religion. By the Rev. F. HOMES DUDDEN, D.D., of Lincoln College, Oxford. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

The Sermons in this Volume deal more or less directly with various aspects of the Person and Work of our Lord, or with the leading principles of His Teaching.

The Progress of Revelation. By the Rev. Canon G. A. COOKE, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scriptures, Oxford. Post 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

The Sermons in this Volume illustrate the various ways in which we may connect the Old Testament with the New, and, without assuming any mechanical theory, find evidence of a continuous expansion in the progress of revelation.

The World's Epoch-Makers.

Edited by OLIPHANT SMEATON, M.A.

IN NEAT CROWN 8vo VOLUMES. :: :: PRICE **3s.** EACH.

'An excellent series of biographical studies.'—*Athenæum.*

'We advise our readers to keep a watch on this most able series. It promises to be a distinct success. The volumes before us are the most satisfactory books of the sort we have ever read.'—*Methodist Times.*

The following Volumes have now been Issued:—

Buddha and Buddhism. By ARTHUR LILLIE.

Luther and the German Reformation. By Principal T. M. LINDSAY, D.D.

Wesley and Methodism. By F. J. SNELL, M.A.

Cranmer and the English Reformation. By A. D. INNES, M.A.

William Herschel and his Work. By JAMES SIME, M.A.

Francis and Dominic. By Professor J. HERKLESS, D.D.

Savonarola. By G. M'HARDY, D.D.

Anselm and his Work. By Rev. A. C. WELCH, B.D.

Origen and Greek Patristic Theology. By Rev. W. FAIRWEATHER, D.D.

Muhammad and his Power. By P. DE LACY JOHNSTONE, M.A.(Oxon.).

The Medici and the Italian Renaissance. By OLIPHANT SMEATON, M.A., Edinburgh.

Plato. By Professor D. G. RITCHIE, M.A., LL.D.

Wycliffe and the Lollards. By Rev. J. C. CARRICK, B.D.

Pascal and the Port Royalists. By Professor W. CLARK, LL.D., D.C.L., Trinity College, Toronto.

Euclid. By Emeritus Professor THOMAS SMITH, D.D., LL.D.

Hegel and Hegelianism. By Professor R. MACKINTOSH, D.D., Lancashire Independent College, Manchester.

Hume and his Influence on Philosophy and Theology. By Professor J. ORR, D.D., Glasgow.

Rousseau and Naturalism in Life and Thought. By Professor W. H. HUDSON, M.A.

Descartes, Spinoza, and the New Philosophy. By Principal J. IVERACH, D.D., Aberdeen.

Socrates. By Rev. J. T. FORBES, M.A., Glasgow.

Newman and his Influence on Religious Life and Thought. By C. SAROLEA, Ph.D., Litt. Doc., University of Edinburgh.

Marcus Aurelius and the Later Stoics. By F. W. BUSSELL, D.D., Vice-Principal of Brasenose College, Oxford.

Kant and his Philosophical Revolution. By Professor R. M. WENLEY, D.Sc., Ph.D., University of Michigan.

T. & T. CLARK, **38 George Street, EDINBURGH.**
14 Paternoster Square, LONDON.

Date Due

Oct 23			
Feb 26-39			
7/10/43			
12/23			
3/2/55			
9-28			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BS
1505
B472
42249
AUTHOR
Bennett, W.H.
TITLE The religion of the post-exilic prophets.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
FEB 5 '77	Laura Reeb	
MAY 14 '87	MHH Barry S. Hoe	

42249

No. 1157-A